

A
'73
C45

THE CHURCH AND THE CITY: AN HISTORICAL AND SOCIAL PSYCHOLOGICAL
STUDY OF ATTITUDES TOWARD INNER CITY WORK
AMONG SEVENTH-DAY ADVENTIST LEADERS

A Dissertation
Presented to
the Faculty of the School of Theology
at Claremont

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Doctor of Ministry

by
Theodore Jerry Chamberlain
June 1973

PERMISSION TO COPY
MUST BE OBTAINED
FROM AUTHOR.

This dissertation, written by

Theodore Jerry Chamberlain,
*has been presented to and accepted by the Faculty
of the School of Theology at Claremont in partial
fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of*

DOCTOR OF MINISTRY

Faculty Committee

Sam S. Rhoades

F. Thomas Trotter

June 1973
Date

F. Thomas Trotter
Dean

831069

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

My sincere appreciation goes first of all to the leaders of the Seventh-day Adventist Church, who through their response in the careful and diligent completion of the questionnaire made this dissertation possible.

Special thanks, of course, goes to the members of my committee-- Professor Dan D. Rhoades and Dean F. Thomas Trotter--for their invaluable aid throughout the formulation, administration, and completion of the research.

Finally, to my wife, Faye Okuno Chamberlain, goes a very special thanks for her stimulation at the onset of my professional study, her patience throughout the six years that study has entailed, and her unfailing assistance with the writing, proofreading, and typing of the manuscript.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| Chapter | Page |
|--|------|
| I. INTRODUCTION | 1 |
| II. A THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK FOR THE STUDY OF ATTITUDES. | 5 |
| The Qualities, Composition, and Acquisition of Attitudes. | 5 |
| An attempt at a definition | 7 |
| The relation of attitudes to values | 8 |
| The components of attitudes | 9 |
| Attitude consistency | 9 |
| The functions of attitudes | 10 |
| Socialization—the acquisition of attitudes | 12 |
| Summary | 13 |
| Methodology in the Study of Attitudes | 13 |
| Attitude scales | 14 |
| Accuracy of the scales | 16 |
| Other methods of attitude measurement | 17 |
| III. A SHORT HISTORY OF SEVENTH-DAY ADVENTISTS AND THE CITY | 18 |
| IV. THE RESEARCH DESIGN | 23 |
| The Scope | 23 |
| The population | 23 |
| The sample | 23 |
| The Bogardus Social Distance Scale | 27 |
| The Questionnaire | 29 |
| Procedure for Analyzing the Data | 30 |
| V. ITEM ANALYSIS: THE COMPLETE PROJECT, INCLUDING WRITE-IN COMMENTS | 32 |
| The Bogardus Social Distance Scale | 32 |
| The Questionnaire | 40 |
| General Comments | 64 |

| Chapter | Page |
|---|------|
| Personal Characteristics | 66 |
| VI. A CHI-SQUARE ANALYSIS OF RELATIONSHIPS AMONG VARIOUS ASPECTS OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE | 69 |
| Interrelationships of Personal Characteristics and Expressed Attitudes | 69 |
| Interrelationships of Personal Characteristics and the Bogardus Social Distance Scale | 70 |
| Interrelationships of Expressed Attitudes and the Bogardus Social Distance Scale | 74 |
| Interrelationships of Some of the Expressed Attitudes with Others | 75 |
| Interrelationships of Some of the Personal Characteristics with Others | 76 |
| VII. HOW ARE ATTITUDES CHANGED? | 79 |
| The Affective-Cognitive Consistency Theory | 79 |
| The Cognitive Dissonance Theory | 81 |
| Which Attitudes are Changed? | 85 |
| VIII. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS | 87 |
| Summary | 87 |
| Concluding Statements | 92 |
| Implications for Further Research | 92 |
| SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY | 94 |
| APPENDICES | 99 |
| I. The Letter of Introduction and the Questionnaire | 100 |
| II. Item Analysis Table of Responses to the Bogardus Social Distance Scale | 105 |
| III. Item Analysis of Responses to Questions 2-20 | 106 |

| Chapter | Page |
|--|------|
| IV. Item Analysis Tables of Personal Characteristics . . | 110 |
| V. Relationships of Personal Characteristics and Responses to Questions: Selected Chi-Square Tables | 119 |
| VI. Relationships of Personal Characteristics and the Bogardus Social Distance Scale: Selected Chi-Square Tables | 122 |
| VII. Relationships of Responses to Questions and the Bogardus Social Distance Scale: Selected Chi-Square Tables | 136 |
| VIII. Relationships of Some of the Responses to Questions with Others: Selected Chi-Square Tables | 142 |
| IX. Relationships of Some of the Personal Characteristics with Others: Selected Chi-Square Tables | 145 |

LIST OF TABLES

| Table | Page |
|--|------|
| 1. Stratified Population and Sample Used in this Research | 24 |
| 2. Scale-responses from Most Favorable to Least Favorable According to Category 1, Admittance "To close kinship by marriage" | 33 |
| 3. Scale-responses from Most Favorable to Least Favorable According to Category 2, Admittance "To my club as personal chums" | 36 |

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The effects of attitudes are evident all around us, for they carry expectancies about our own behavior and that of others; they touch all aspects of social life. "Our tastes, manners, and morals reflect our attitudes" and also the social values which underlie them. Attitudes and values are acquired as a result of socialization, i.e. of our introduction to the norms of society. As such, they are largely inseparable from the social context which produces, sustains, and elicits them.¹

However, attitudes are also the result of unique individual experiences that have taken place during past social interaction. "These experiences are conveniently summed up by the individual's present attitudes which, in turn, have direct effects on his ongoing, future-oriented activity."²

Having attitudes toward people, groups of people, and other objects in society then, is basic to being a human being. And if such objects have attained a certain significance in a culture, one can expect that the members of that culture will be even more likely to have attitudes--and even strong attitudes--toward such objects.

¹Edwin P. Hollander, Principles and Methods of Social Psychology (New York: Oxford University Press, 1967), p. 121.

²Ibid., p. 113.

The inner city and the groups--minority and otherwise--that live there are types of just such objects. A certain emphasis has been placed upon them in the last decade and so one might expect that most people would have definite attitudes toward each. Due to an interest I have had in those attitudes this paper has been written. I felt that the leaders of the Seventh-day Adventist Church would especially have strong attitudes toward the inner city and the work that has been carried on there by some of that church's members. "The church and the city" has become a hot issue in the circles of evangelical Christianity, and the Seventh-day Adventist Church is by no means an exception. Just what attitudes this small denomination's leaders might have greatly interested me, for I knew that the attitudes one holds provide a partial basis, at least, for the further or subsequent organization of his behavior.³

In addition to the research that I wanted to do on the history of the Seventh-day Adventist Church in the city, I decided that several questions would need to be answered if I was to understand to any degree the present attitudes of these leaders toward inner city work:

1. What do Seventh-day Adventist leaders think about the urban projects that the church has carried on? In general, do they approve or disapprove?
2. Do they feel that Ellen White (an explanation of the importance of Mrs. White to the research will be explained further below) would approve or disapprove if she were alive today?

³John T. Doby, Introduction to Social Psychology (New York: Appleton-Century Crofts, 1966), p. 152.

3. How much do they know about inner city programs?

4. If they are acquainted with such programs, where did they get their information? Do they consider the source reliable?

5. Are their ages, positions, or other personal characteristics related to any significant degree to their feelings towards such programs?

6. Do they feel more Seventh-day Adventist ministers should be involved in inner city projects? If so, in what capacity?

7. Should more denominational schools be involved? Which ones? To what degree?

8. How would the attitudes of church leaders relate to their scores on a test that measures prejudice?

9. Would the leaders themselves be willing to become involved in inner city projects?

10. Do the leaders feel that inner city work is necessary to the mission of the Seventh-day Adventist Church? And since the last word of the denominational name denotes an expectancy of the imminent return of Christ, must inner city work be done before that event can take place?

11. Finally, Saturday is a sacred day to Seventh-day Adventists. How do the leaders feel about work in the city being done on the "Sabbath?"

I felt that if I could get answers to these questions, and could compare those answers to scores on a test of prejudice, that I could understand to some degree the attitudes of Seventh-day Adventist leaders toward present-day inner city work. However, the old adage

that one cannot understand the present without some knowledge of the past, certainly was true in this case. Prejudicial attitudes toward both minority groups and the city have a history of over a century in the Seventh-day Adventist Church. Consequently, anyone attempting to research such attitudes must to some degree understand the history of the church with relation to the urban areas and their inhabitants.

To better understand the differing attitudes of the leadership of the Seventh-day Adventist Church toward inner city work was the purpose of the research reported in this paper. Before beginning the project, I knew, to some degree, the history of the church in relation to the city--a sketch of which is included in Chapter III. I also had been in contact with various members of the church leadership, and knew of several conflicting opinions or attitudes regarding the city and race relations which might come to the surface if an attitude study were to be carried out. Thus, with much interest and a little apprehension as to the results obtained from a church of which I am a member, I embarked upon the research which is reported in the following pages.

CHAPTER II

A THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK FOR THE STUDY OF ATTITUDES

THE QUALITIES, COMPOSITION, AND ACQUISITION OF ATTITUDES

Three major aspects are usually included in the study of attitudes: (1) The relationship of their components, especially in terms of cognitive interaction and individual adjustment; (2) Their source, or the patterns by which attitudes are acquired through learning; and (3) Attitude change, with reference to the influences on the individual which can result in the incorporation of new experience and the modification of attitudes.¹ Most of the literature on attitude study today is limited to one of these aspects. However, in earlier studies "it was quite common to rely largely on the description of an individual's attitudes, their direction in terms of valence, and the belief systems that they constituted."² It is this method of study which mainly has been used in the research reported in this paper.

Attitudes probably interest the social psychologist more than the other subvarieties of social motives because of their key role in

¹Edwin P. Hollander, Principles and Methods of Social Psychology (New York: Oxford University Press, 1967), p. 121.

²Ibid., p. 120.

social behavior,³ or because of the complexity of their study. The objects toward which they are directed may be either concrete or abstract, personal or remote;⁴ they may be directed toward a wide range of social complexities, including the institutions and organizations of society, racial and religious minorities, or political and social issues.⁵ And to further complicate their study, many attitudes are often involved in any one situation of evaluation. They also are not directly open to observation, but must be inferred from verbal expression or overt behavior.⁶

But the study of attitudes is not only difficult--it is also very interesting. The attitudes an individual holds on an issue may determine the judgment he passes on it, and therefore influence the way he acts almost irrespective of the objective information he has available to him. "People with strong attitudes are ready to pass judgment and act in terms of their attitudes and without waiting for the facts."⁷ A person may also develop attitudes that are at least partially intellectualized out of their need to satisfy two or more conflicting systems of beliefs and/or values, and it is this possibility

³Henry Clay Lindgren, An Introduction to Social Psychology (New York: Wiley, 1969), p. 71.

⁴Paul F. Secord and Carl W. Backman, Social Psychology (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1964), p. 100.

⁵Hollander, p. 115.

⁶Secord and Backman, p. 98.

⁷John T. Doby, Introduction to Social Psychology (New York: Appleton-Century Crofts, 1966), p. 152.

which makes the present study open to so many interesting discoveries.⁸ Because of this need, they may be poor predictors of the behavior that actually emerges.

An attempt at a definition

Many social psychologists have tried to formulate a definition of attitudes, and each leaves something to be desired. However, those authors most prominent in the field usually give definitions which parallel each other quite closely. Rokeach, the theorist asked to write on "The Nature of Attitudes" for the International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences, defined an attitude like this: a learned and relatively enduring organization of beliefs about an object or situation disposing a person toward some preferred response.⁹ Secord and Backman, in their text on social psychology, state: "The term attitude refers to certain regularities of an individual's feelings, thought, and predispositions to act toward some aspect of his environment,"¹⁰ and Doby, in his Introduction of Social Psychology, says that "Attitudes refer to consistencies or regularities of an individual's thoughts, feelings, and predispositions to act toward values or objects."¹¹ Although a concept so vague as attitude is very difficult

⁸Lindgren, p. 72.

⁹Milton Rokeach, "The Nature of Attitudes" in The International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences. I, 450.

¹⁰Secord and Backman, p. 97.

¹¹Doby, p. 299.

to define with much precision, one can easily see that most of the literature is fairly consistent when it comes to that task.

The relation of attitudes to values¹²

Although individuals hold many more attitudes than values, those attitudes are often organized into what some have called "value systems."^{13, 14} These value systems are usually determined from a measure of attitudes, for they may be considered to be the core component of a "clustering of attitudes"¹⁵ which direct a person's behavior on a long-range basis. They, therefore, have more central quality, and are much less subject to the effects of situational change.¹⁶

A grown person probably has tens of thousands of beliefs, hundreds of attitudes, but only dozens of values. A value system is an hierarchial organization--a rank ordering--of ideals or values in terms of importance. To one person truth, beauty, and freedom may be at the top of the list, and thrift, order, and cleanliness at the bottom; to another person, the order may be reversed.¹⁷

Their cultural linkage is another distinction between attitudes

¹²The term ideology should also be defined here so as not to cause confusion: It is used to designate integrated sets of beliefs and values that justify the policies of a group or an institution.

¹³Secord and Backman, p. 100.

¹⁴Rokeach, I, 455.

¹⁵Hollander, pp. 114, 115.

¹⁶Ibid., p. 115.

¹⁷Rokeach, I, 455.

and values. The culture has certain values, rather than attitudes. Thus, individuals are sustained in their values by the cultural surroundings.¹⁸ Hollander further notes that, "Both attitudes and values have properties which define what is expected and what is desired. They can both therefore be thought of as motivational-perceptual states which direct action."¹⁹

The components of attitudes

Attitudes involve three elements--thoughts, feelings, and tendencies to act a certain way which reflects the thoughts and feelings. In social psychological circles the thought part is usually referred to as the cognitive element, sometimes called the belief-disbelief component. The affective element refers to the feelings or the like-dislike component. A readiness to respond or the pre-dispositions to act is usually called the action component or behavioral element.

Attitude consistency

There tends to be some degree of consistency among all attitudes held by a person,²⁰ however, the literature in this area is almost completely restricted to attitude change. Since this topic will be covered in Chapter VII, I will only summarize what have been

¹⁸Hollander, p. 114.

¹⁹Ibid.

²⁰Lindgren, p. 74.

shown to be the reasons for attitude change. The works of both Rosenberg and Festinger are probably the most comprehensive and they list the following four reasons:

1. Individuals not fully aware of their attitudes.
2. Conflicting role patterns.
3. Differences between attitudes and actions.
4. Differences between the cognitive and affective components of an attitude.^{21, 22, 23, 24, 25}

The functions of attitudes

Attitudes are many times functional, in that they can provide emotional satisfaction for the individual. An example would be the person who harbors a considerable degree of hostility but finds an outlet for its expression in prejudiced attitudes toward certain minority groups.²⁶

The four kinds of functions which form the motivational basis

²¹M. J. Rosenberg, "Cognitive Structure and Attitudinal Affect," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, LIII (1956), 367-374.

²²Rosenberg, "A Structural Theory of Attitude Dynamics," Public Opinion Quarterly XXIV (1960a), 319-340.

²³Rosenberg, "Cognitive Reorganization in Response to the Hypnotic Reversal of Attitudinal Affect," Journal of Personality XXVIII (1960b), 39-63.

²⁴L. Festinger, A Theory of Cognitive Dissonance (Evanston: Row, Peterson, 1957).

²⁵Festinger, Conflict, Decision, and Dissonance (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1964).

²⁶Secord and Backman, p. 99.

for attitudes are:

1. The instrumental, adjustive, or utilitarian function.
2. The ego-defensive function.
3. The value-expressive function.
4. The knowledge function.

The adjustive function refers to the favorable responses the individual achieves from his associates by evidencing acceptable attitudes.

With regard to underlying processes, the ego-defensive function allows the individual to protect himself from acknowledging his deficiencies. For example, prejudice helps to sustain the individual's self-concept by maintaining a sense of superiority over others.

Through the value-expressive function of attitudes, the individual achieves self-expression in terms of those values which are most cherished by him. He seeks to openly express his commitments.

In regard to the knowledge function, Katz says that people seek a degree of predictability, consistency, and stability in their perception of the world.²⁷

These functions, of course, are interrelated, rather than highly segmented. Accordingly, several motives may be simultaneously served by holding a given attitude.

²⁷D. Katz, "The Functional Approach to the Study of Attitudes" Public Opinion Quarterly XXIV (1960), 163-204.

Socialization--the acquisition of attitudes

Human socialization is not just the process of learning specific skills for using machines, language, and problem-solving behavior, but also the learning of the cultural prescriptions and proscriptions of a particular society. These include attitudes toward different ethnic, religious, and racial groups toward authority; toward right and wrong; toward one's responsibility to fellows and the larger community.²⁸

As I stated before, attitudes are very largely inseparable from the social context which produces, sustains, and elicits them. Like values, they are acquired as a result of being introduced into the ways of society. These "ways" are sometimes called societal norms, and, as such, provide frames of reference for perceiving people and people's behavior; thus they are inseparable from attitudes toward people.²⁹

Socialization is, then, very much a matter of taking on appropriate attitudes and values. It begins in the family, but through several kinds of processes, continues on through life, subject to the effects of ongoing experience through adulthood.³⁰ The child is born with the possibility of a wide range of behavior. But he is "led to develop actual behavior which is confined within a much narrower range--the range of what is customary and acceptable for him according to the standards of his group."³¹

²⁸Doby, p. 273.

²⁹Ibid., p. 135.

³⁰Hollander, p. 127.

³¹I. Child, "Socialization" in Gardner Lindzey (ed.) The Handbook of Social Psychology. (Reading: Addison-Wesley, 1954), p. 655.

Thus, the acquisition of attitudes through socialization may be accomplished by three major patterns:

1. through direct contact with the object of the attitude,
2. through interaction with others holding the attitude, and,
3. through more deep-seated values arising out of up-bringing experiences within the family.

Summary

We have noticed several qualities of attitudes which may be generalized as follows: they are beliefs and feelings about an object or set of objects in the social environment; they are learned; they tend to persist, though subject to the effects of experience; and they are directive states in the psychological field which affect action.³²

An understanding of these qualities will prove valuable in the study and interpretation of the following research project.

METHODOLOGY IN THE STUDY OF ATTITUDES

"Attitudes play a major part in both capturing and shaping experience."³³ Because of this, they have been a major focal point in the studies done by social psychologists. The literature of these scientists very definitely shows that in the tradition of attitude measurement, they have been preoccupied with a single issue rather than with the clustering of attitudes.

³²Hollander, p. 121.

³³Ibid., p. 140.

There are several dimensions of attitude measurement with which one must be acquainted to understand the research in the field:

1. Direction--the attitude is for or against. (This dimension is the general concern in the following study.)

2. Intensity--the strength of the attitude toward the object. (This is the specific concern, and usually is demonstrated in the "write-in" comments.)

3. Centrality--is it close to the center of a system of attitudes and values? Strongly held attitudes are likely to be central to a set of beliefs.

4. Salience--the visibility of the attitude.

5. Consistency--the extent to which attitudes and attitude systems fit together.

The direction of an attitude is essentially the cognitive component of belief-disbelief, often stated in terms of agree-disagree. The degree of agreement or disagreement extends this concern to how much plus or minus valence is associated with the attitude. The intensity of an attitude is essentially the same as degree since it, too, measures the affective component, usually in terms of "strength of feelings."³⁴

Attitude scales

Attitudes have usually been measured through attitude scales, questionnaires, interviews, projective tests, and even observations of behavior. However, use of the attitude scales has been the most widespread approach. In this study, both a scale and a questionnaire were used.

³⁴Ibid., pp. 141, 142.

Typically, the items on an attitude scale should all relate to some common entity, person, issue, or activity--e.g. inner-city work. It should represent a wide range of positions an individual might hold, and also should include a number of statements that will discriminate between people having different attitudinal positions.³⁵

One of the earliest scales was developed by Thurstone and Chave. People were asked to judge items on a scale of favorability or unfavorability toward the object of the attitude.

The most common of the attitude scales is one developed by Likert. Statements are collected which represent apparently positive or negative views of the attitudinal object (the California F Scale is built on the Likert procedure). The subject indicates his degree of agreement or disagreement with each item, usually on a scale from one to five or one to seven. A score is obtained by summing the values for each of these separate responses.

Another approach to scaling a person's position on an issue was developed by Bogardus. Basically, it measures attitudes toward various ethnic groups, including nationalities, by a series of statements ranging from the most favorable to the least favorable, i.e. the greatest social distance. The important feature of this scale is that it is constructed so that accepting the first alternative should imply the acceptance of all the others.

A modern counterpart of the Bogardus scale is that of Guttman.

³⁵Ibid., pp. 142, 143.

Rather than beginning with a set of items graduated in an obvious way, Guttman seeks the underlying order within a series of questions that can be responded to by a simple "yes" or "no."

There are three stages of attitude measurement: (1) administration, (2) scoring, and (3) interpreting. It is the attitude scale which is probably the easiest measure to use in all three stages. It suffers in multi-dimensionality, but makes up for such restrictions in terms of ease of use.

Accuracy of the scales

As with any social or psychological measure, attitude measurement in any form involves considerations of adequacy in terms of reliability and validity. These issues have to do with the degree to which a measure is consistent, and whether it measures what it is supposed to measure. Up to a point, the reliability is increased by repeated readings. Therefore, many items are used in constructing both scales and questionnaires. To increase reliability, twenty items were used in this study. Some questions were even repeated but in different form.³⁶ The time factor is also a consideration in measurement test construction and administration; for questions from a former test may be remembered by the respondents, or their attitudes might even change.

Further problems arise in avoiding bias from the framing of the questions, the sequence of items within the format of the attitude

³⁶Ibid., pp. 145, 146.

scale or questionnaire, and the effect of the interviewer. If all of the above items are carefully considered, one can be quite certain that an accurate scale or questionnaire will result.

Other methods of attitude measurement

Because an attitude scale essentially measures only one dimension, it is difficult for it to readily represent the complexity of attitudinal systems. Because of this limitation, measures of a multi-dimensional nature can also be used.

Measures of a less restricted nature than the attitude scale are questionnaires, interviews, projective tests, and even observations of behavior. Each of these measures can be used to measure attitudes, although the scoring and interpreting is more difficult.

CHAPTER III

A SHORT HISTORY OF SEVENTH-DAY ADVENTISTS AND THE CITY

The Seventh-day Adventist Church takes literally the so-called "Gospel Commission" found in the New Testament: "Go ye therefore and teach all nations, . . ."¹ Because of this command the church has been sending missionaries to almost every part of the world since the first, Elder J. N. Andrews, sailed for Europe in 1874.

Although most Seventh-day Adventist missionaries are sent to countries outside the continental United States, many have felt the call to "spread the gospel" right at home. To great numbers of them the cities of our nation are mission fields in and of themselves. This emphasis has been especially noted in and around the educational institutions of the church; many projects have been initiated by college students in the large metropolitan areas near the schools they attend: e.g., Washington, D.C., Los Angeles, and Chicago.

This emphasis is not new in the Seventh-day Adventist Church, however. As early as 1860 a mission was established in New York City. By the 1880's Ellen White (an early and most influential leader in the Seventh-day Adventist Church) was encouraging "inner city work" in many areas.² In 1885, she wrote a long article on inner city work that

¹Matthew 28:19.

²Jonathan Butler, "Ellen G. White and the Chicago Mission," Spectrum, II:1 (Winter 1970), 41-51.

now appears in volume five of Testimonies for the Church. And, in a letter to a conference president who was shirking his responsibility to urban areas she wrote: "Shall the prince of darkness be left in undisputed possession of our great cities because it cost something to sustain missions?"³ She then discussed financial matters before adding: "Let those who would follow Christ fully come up to the work, even if it be over the heads of ministers and president. . ."⁴

Other Seventh-day Adventist leaders also noted the importance of city missions in the work of the church. Doctor John Harvey Kellogg began the medical work and other kinds of missionary labor in the city of Chicago. He soon was to establish the Chicago Medical Mission, and even to start a medical school for the training of Adventist physicians. And Elder S. N. Haskell wrote in 1884:

We have now actually established missions in Chicago, Ill., St. Louis, Mo., New York City, Buffalo and Syracuse, N.Y., Boston, Mass., Portland, Me., San Francisco, Cal., and Portland, Ore. There are also other cities where preparations are being made to open missions the present season, and much missionary labor is performed in many cities where no such arrangements have been made.⁶

In the same article he stated that "City missions are becoming a very important feature of our work."⁷ In fact, at the 1888 General

³Ellen G. White, Testimonies for the Church (Mountain View, Calif.: Pacific Press, 1948), p. 369.

⁴Ibid., pp. 369, 370.

⁵Richard W. Schwartz, "John Harvey Kellogg: Adventism's Social Gospel Advocate," Spectrum, I:2 (Spring 1969), 15-28.

⁶S. N. Haskell, "Our City Missions," Review and Herald, LXI:18 (April 29, 1884), 278.

⁷Ibid.

Conference Session held in Minneapolis, Minnesota, it was reported that the church was operating twenty-two city missions.

By 1900, Ellen White was advocating still further involvement within the large cities. She said that Seventh-day Adventists must "Warn the cities, and raise in them memorials for God. There must be a force of influence in the cities, that the message of warning shall be heard."⁸ Later in the same article she wrote, "Our restaurants must be in the cities; for otherwise the workers in these restaurants could not reach the people and teach them the principles of right living."⁹ Further on she states, "the principles of health reform are to be promulgated as a part of the work in the cities."¹⁰ Even as late as 1914, only one year before her death, Mrs. White expressed her concern for the foreigners in the major centers such as New York and Chicago.¹¹

The work of Seventh-day Adventists in the cities of the United States soon tapered off, however. Many denominational members and leaders as well used such statements from Ellen White as the following to justify their retreat from the "evils of city life:"

⁸White, Medical Ministry (Mountain View, Calif.: Pacific Press, 1932), p. 303.

⁹Ibid.

¹⁰Ibid., p. 304.

¹¹White, Testimonies, pp. 3, 4.

Get out of the cities as soon as possible, and purchase a little piece of land, where you can have a garden, where your children can watch the flowers growing, and learn from them the lessons of simplicity and purity.¹²

It is not God's will that His people shall settle in the cities, where there is constant turmoil and confusion. Their children should be spared this; for the whole system is demoralized by the hurry and rush and noise. The Lord desires His people to move into the country, where they can settle on the land, and raise their own fruits and vegetables, and where their children can be brought in direct contact with the works of God in nature. Take your families away from the cities is my message.¹³

More and more, as time advances, our people will have to leave the cities. For years we have been instructed that our brethren and sisters, and especially families with children, should plan to leave the cities as the way opens for them to do so.¹⁴

Most Seventh-day Adventists failed to consider the statements above and others like them in light of their context. Whenever Ellen White would state, "As God's commandment-keeping people, we must leave the cities," she would then continue with something like the following: "As did Enoch, we must work in the cities but not dwell in them."¹⁵ Other statements to the same effect are: "The cities are to be worked from outposts."¹⁶ "We must make wise plans to warn the cities, and at the same time live where we can shield our children and ourselves

¹²White, Selected Messages from the Writings of Ellen G. White (Washington: Review and Herald, 1958), p. 356.

¹³Ibid., p. 358.

¹⁴Ibid., p. 360.

¹⁵White, Evangelism (Washington: Review and Herald, 1958), p. 356.

¹⁶Ibid., p. 77.

from the contaminating and demoralizing influences so prevalent in these places."¹⁷

Consequently, by the 1920's almost no inner city mission work was carried on by the Seventh-day Adventist Church. Periodically, some type of labor would be started in one city or another--e.g., a welfare center--but nothing compared to the emphasis put on this type of work in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. In fact, it was not until the 1960's that any extensive inner-city programs were again initiated by the denomination or its institutions.

In the mid and late 1960's programs such as the "Urban Service Corps," at Columbia Union College, Takoma Park, Maryland, SLAVE in East Los Angeles, California, and the Washington, D.C. summer program sponsored by the Seventh-day Adventist Theological Seminary, began to have their influence on the denomination and its policies. "Inner-city work" soon became a well-known phrase in many Seventh-day Adventist circles as new programs began to spring up near most of the church's colleges and universities. However, this new emphasis was not met with complete approval by everyone in the denomination. In fact, many had stated their disapproval of such programs and of the church's involvement in the city in any way. The research which follows is an attempt to measure the differing attitudes toward what has and is happening in the church during this crucial period of its history.

¹⁷Ibid., pp. 76, 77.

CHAPTER IV

THE RESEARCH DESIGN

THE SCOPE

The population

As I explained in the introduction to this paper, the purpose of the research was to ascertain what the attitudes of Seventh-day Adventist leaders are toward inner-city work. Consequently, the population for such a project would be every leader in the S.D.A.¹ Church. However, I felt that the population would better represent the church if it was limited to certain areas. (See below--"The sample"--and the footnote concerning selection of conferences.)

Lists of those included in the population were taken from the Seventh-day Adventist Yearbook: 1970. The total number included came to 962, stratified according to Table 1.

The sample

The sample used in this study was a stratified random sample including the following strata:

1. Leaders employed by the General Conference of S.D.A.'s.

¹Throughout the rest of this paper, S.D.A. will be used to designate Seventh-day Adventist.

Table 1: Stratified Population and Sample Used in this Research

| | Population | Sample |
|--|------------|--------|
| 1. General Conference Officers | 101 | (51) |
| 2. Union Conference Officers | | |
| Columbia Union | 17 | |
| Lake Union | 10 | |
| Pacific Union | 25 | |
| TOTAL | 52 | (52) |
| 3. Local Conference Officers | | |
| Allegheny East | 10 | |
| Chesapeake | 11 | |
| Potomac | 22 | |
| TOTAL-Columbia Union | 43 | |
| Illinois | 17 | |
| Indiana | 12 | |
| Lake Region | 11 | |
| Michigan | 28 | |
| TOTAL-Lake Union | 68 | |
| Southeastern California | 27 | |
| Southern California | 21 | |
| TOTAL-Pacific Union | 48 | |
| TOTAL | 159 | (53) |
| 4. Local Pastors | | |
| Allegheny East | 35 | |
| Chesapeake | 20 | |
| Potomac | 85 | |
| TOTAL-Columbia Union | 140 | |
| Illinois | 60 | |
| Indiana | 30 | |
| Lake Region | 30 | |
| Michigan | 115 | |
| TOTAL-Lake Union | 235 | |
| Southeastern California | 110 | |
| Southern California | 165 | |
| TOTAL-Pacific Union | 275 | |
| TOTAL | 650 | (130) |
| GRAND TOTAL | 962 | (286) |

2. Leaders employed by selected² union conferences--the Lake Union, the Columbia Union, and the Pacific Union Conferences of S.D.A.'s.

3. Leaders employed by selected local conferences--the Allegheny East, Chesapeake, Potomac, Illinois, Indiana, Lake Region, Michigan, Southeastern California, and Southern California Conferences of S.D.A.'s.

4. Local pastors employed by the above local conferences.

Those included in the sample were chosen by a standard random sampling technique, but separately for each of the four strata. I wanted to have a fairly even number of representatives from all three executive levels, and that could only be accomplished by taking each stratum as a separate entity. The total population of General Conference leaders included 101 persons, the union conferences 52 persons, and the local conferences 159. For the first stratum I took every other name after randomly choosing the first number, leaving a sample of 51 persons. The union conference population came to only 52, so I included all of them in the sample. For the local conferences I used the same method as on the first stratum, but I took every third name instead of every other one, leaving a sample of 53 persons. The total population of local pastors was 650 persons, of which I wanted no more in the sample than the total of the other three strata. The

²The selections of both the union and local conferences used in the sample was determined on the basis of locality. If such a conference included or was geographically near to locations where an inner-city project was being or had been carried on by Seventh-day Adventists, it was included in the sample.

sample already amounted to 156 persons, and I had hoped for not more than 250 to 300 in total. Since the number 650 is evenly divisible by five, I used the same technique as for the first and third strata above, but chose only every fifth name. This left 130 persons in the fourth stratum of the sample. The total then came to 286, a number approximately mid-way between the extremes I had hoped for.

In any future study of this denomination's leaders, the weighting of the sample should probably be given more careful consideration. Because of practical reasons, the above sample was used without much consideration as to possible skewing of answers because of weight distribution. As it turned out, however, the sample included is probably perfect for this study, when the distribution of power and the decision-making processes of the church are considered.

The questionnaires were distributed by sending each in a separate envelope--including the questionnaire and a stamped, self-addressed return envelope--to the address indicated for each person in the S.D.A. Yearbook.

Because of the nature of the subject of the questionnaire, I was very skeptical about the percentage of returns. However, by the data set arbitrarily as a cut-off, 135 persons had responded for approximately a 47 per cent return. The percentage of returns on the basis of the four different strata, however, is not quite as encouraging. Response from the General Conference level was by far the best--67 per cent. Then, in descending order, came the local conferences with 58 per cent, the union conferences with 42 per cent, and only 30

per cent for the local pastors. However, those on the executive level are generally considered to be in the positions of leadership; and since the attitudes of leaders are the focus of this study, I felt that the return was very acceptable.

Examination of the characteristics of respondents showed that they probably were fairly representative of the total population, an exception possibly being the weight on the upper end of the age scale. This problem possibly is a result of the much higher response at the General Conference level, which generally employs those leaders with relatively more experience. In fact, a chi-square analysis of the variables "age" and "position of employment" showed that over 90 per cent of those respondents holding a position at the General Conference level were 45 years of age or older. With respect to age, 6 per cent were 29 and under; 25 per cent were 30 to 44; 56 per cent were 45-59, and 13 per cent were 60 and over; 1 per cent gave no answer. (Because of rounding, per cents may not total to 100.) Ninety-eight per cent were male and 2 per cent female. Regarding race--a question I felt might be left unanswered by many--88 per cent were Caucasian or "white;" 10 per cent were Negro or "black;" 1 man was Oriental; and only 1 per cent failed to respond. The category of "marital status" also showed the expected response: 97 per cent were married, with only 3 persons single. (A response blank entitled "other" was included, but no one checked that alternative.)

THE BOGARDUS SOCIAL DISTANCE SCALE

I decided that I could not understand the attitudes of church

leaders toward the city without knowing something about their feelings toward the minority groups that live there and that had been the focus of the inner-city work carried on by church groups. Consequently, I began a search for some type of scale that had been shown to accurately measure those attitudes.

E. S. Bogardus developed such a scale almost 50 years ago and reported his findings in the Journal of Applied Sociology under the title, "Measuring Social Distances."³ Because of the title of this article, the measure has come to be known as the Bogardus Social Distance Scale.

Generally, this scale measures attitudes toward various ethnic groups by a series of statements ranging from the most favorable to the least favorable--in other words, the greatest social distance. It does not, however, indicate merit or traits of the respective races, but rather something of the extent of the social contacts open or closed to each race.⁴ Its function should only be viewed "as a means for securing adequate interpretations of the varying degrees and grades of understanding and feeling that exist in social situations."⁵ As such, it explains the nature of a great deal of interaction among races, and charts the character of social relations.

In the study of attitudes, as in any other research in the

³Edgar S. Bogardus, "Measuring Social Distance," Journal of Applied Sociology, IX (1925), 299-308.

⁴Ibid., p. 302.

⁵Ibid., p. 299.

social sciences, care must be taken not to generalize to a degree not warranted from the results of one test. In the Bogardus Social Distance Scale, each index raises a question mark; "each raises important questions concerning the experiences of the raters and the relationships of the raters to the races that are being judged."⁶ Thus, one must be aware that such a test can raise more questions for further study than it answers.

A modified form (see Appendix I) of this scale was used at the first part of the questionnaire. All seven of the original gradients used by Bogardus were included, but the list of racial and nationality groups was formed on the basis of applicability to the topic under consideration. Thus, all minority groups likely to affect the attitudes of the respondents in this study were included along with others interspersed for comparison. To avoid any seeming prejudice in the scale make-up, these groups were listed in alphabetical order.

THE QUESTIONNAIRE

A four-page, 21 question, multiple choice--except for the Bogardus Social Distance Scale (question one) and the factual data included in question 21--questionnaire was used in this study. (see Appendix I). Included with almost every question, after the last choice, was space for write-in comments. Respondents were also encouraged by means of the directions for questions 2-20 to make any

⁶Ibid., p. 304.

additional comments they wished, even using the back of the page if necessary. No specific pilot study was included in making the final form. However, after the initial questionnaire was formed (on the basis of the specifying questions listed on pages two and three of the introduction) and criticized, a second form was distributed to students in an Introduction to Sociology class that I was teaching at the time to undergraduate students at Loma Linda University. Each student was then given the opportunity to criticize the questionnaire as an assignment in "the methodology of the social sciences." From the suggestions made by these students and others made by close acquaintances who had been or were involved in various inner-city projects, the final form was compiled.

Approximately 300 questionnaires were mimeographed and sent out separately, one to each person in the sample. A self-addressed, stamped return envelope was also included with the questionnaire as an added stimulation for return. No coding technique was used because of the promise in the cover letter of complete anonymity for each respondent. This, of course, restricted follow-up on non-returns--a letter would have to be sent to each person in the sample, an expense I could not bear at the time.

PROCEDURE FOR ANALYZING THE DATA

The information on the 135 returned questionnaires was transferred to IBM data cards and analyzed under NIH Grant RR0027606 at the Loma Linda University Scientific Computation Facility. An item analysis was run on each variable in the study, including a separate

analysis for each group in question one and for each item of factual data in question twenty-one.

Cross tabulations or contingency tables were made between most personal characteristics and most questions and between the results of the Bogardus Social Distance Scale⁷ and some questions and personal characteristics. Chi-square was then used to test statistical significance of relationships shown by these cross-tabulations and to show expected value matrices. Observed and expected frequency tables may be found in the Appendices.

Because attitudes toward Negroes or "Blacks" were considered to be the most significant in terms of the results obtained, and in terms of blacks prevalence in the urban areas under consideration, I only used attitudes toward them in my analysis of the Social Distance Scale.

CHAPTER V

ITEM ANALYSIS: THE COMPLETE PROJECT, INCLUDING WRITE-IN COMMENTS

THE BOGARDUS SOCIAL DISTANCE SCALE

The Bogardus Social Distance Scale included nine ethnic or nationality groups (see Appendix I): (1) English, (2) Indians, (3) Jews, (4) Mexicans, (5) Negroes, (6) Orientals, (7) Puerto Ricans, (8) Russians, and (9) Swedes. Non-responses were fairly high on this scale, ranging from seven per cent for the English and Jews to ten per cent for Swedes and Puerto Ricans.

A definite color line showed up in the responses to this scale. Those ethnic groups rating from first to fourth on the list are generally considered to be "white" skinned; those rating fifth to eighth are "brown" or "red" skinned; and the group given the lowest rating has "black" skin.

The English received the most favorable response from their raters. (see Table 2) One hundred and seventeen (87 per cent) would accept English to close kinship by marriage; five would only admit them to their club as personal chums; two only to their street as neighbors; and one rater would not admit an Englishman to any category higher than number four, "To employment in my occupation."

Receiving acceptance second only to English were the Swedes. They, along with the English, and surprisingly enough, Orientals, were

Table 2: Scale-responses from Most Favorable to Least Favorable
According to Category 1, Admittance "To close kinship by marriage."

| Ethnic Group | Number | Percentage |
|----------------------------------|--------|------------|
| English | 117 | 87 |
| Swedes | 108 | 80 |
| Russians | 87 | 64 |
| Jews | 79 | 59 |
| Indians | 49 | 36 |
| Mexicans | 45 | 33 |
| Orientals ¹ | 38 | 28 |
| Puerto Ricans | 38 | 28 |
| Negroes | 26 | 19 |

¹Although the numbers and percentages are the same for Orientals and Puerto Ricans, Orientals were given a higher position in this table because more of them would be admitted to the second scale category "To my club as personal chums" (53%) than the Puerto Ricans (46%).

the only ones who were never given a rating lower than 4 on the scale. One hundred and eight, or 80 per cent, would admit them to close kinship by marriage, while 10 would admit them only to category 2. Two each checked categories 3 and 4.

At least one respondent placed Russians, Jews, and Puerto Ricans in category 7 of the scale. In spite of this, the Russians and Jews were third and fourth, respectively, on the overall scale, while the Puerto Ricans rated eighth. Each of these three ethnic groups, however, only had one person that would exclude them from the country and it was the same respondent who excluded both Russians and Puerto Ricans.

Russians would be admitted to category 1 by 87 of the respondents; 24 would admit them only to their club as personal chums; they would only be able to live as neighbors with 5 raters; and 3 would admit them only to employment in their occupation. This group was the first to be limited to what might be considered the negative side of the scale axis, numbers 6 and 7. Three respondents said they would allow Russians only to visit their country, and 1 even said he would exclude them from his country.

Jews are the last group of those usually considered to be "white," and were given acceptance that rated fourth on the list of nine. Seventy-nine of the 135 respondents would admit Jews to close kinship by marriage, while 33 would only admit them to their club as personal chums. Eight limited them to category 3, 3 to category 4, and 1 would only allow them citizenship in his country. One person would exclude Jewish people from his country.

Of those groups usually considered to be "non-white," Indians received the most favorable response.² However, the most significant break in scale progression occurs between Jews and Indians, or between the lower end of the "white" part of the scale and the upper end of the "non-white" part (79 or 59% to 49 or 36% giving a favorable response on category 1). With the Indians, another trend is also noted--that where more respondents checked category 12 than category 1 (see Table 3). From here to the bottom of the list on Table 2, there is a steady increase in the number of respondents who checked category 2 (except for the difference between Puerto Ricans and Orientals as noted under Table 3). Nine respondents would only admit Indians to their street as neighbors, 7 would limit them to occupational proximity, and one would only allow them citizenship--no doubt meaning they should be kept on reservations.

The differences in response between Mexicans and Indians was very slight, possibly because of their sometimes common ancestral background, and even their state of visibility or "look-alike" qualities. Only 45 would admit them to category 1, 59 to category 2, 9 each to categories 3 and 4, and 1 would again allow them only citizenship in his country. This person happens also to be the one who gave Indians the same rating and gave no group besides the English higher than a 3 and that rating only to one group.

²It should be noted that no distinction was made on the scale between American and Asian Indians. If some respondents were judging the Asians, it would be interesting that although "black" skinned they were rated at the top of the "non-white" group. One respondent wrote "American" in the margin before the word Indians.

Table 3: Scale-responses from Most Favorable to Least Favorable According to Category 2, Admittance "To my club as personal chums."

Note: The numerical progression of this table is the reverse of Table 2 due to the attitudes of the respondent--if he would include a certain group in category 1, he would not then limit it to category 2. However, if he did not check that group in the first category, he would be more likely to check the second. Such proved to be the case as the reverse progression in the tables show.

| Ethnic Group | Number | Percentage |
|--------------------------------------|--------|------------|
| English | 5 | 4 |
| Swedes | 10 | 7 |
| Russians | 24 | 18 |
| Jews | 33 | 24 |
| Indians | 56 | 41 |
| Mexicans | 59 | 44 |
| Puerto Ricans ³ | 62 | 46 |
| Orientals | 71 | 53 |
| Negroes | 75 | 56 |

³Note that Puerto Ricans and Orientals have switched positions from Table 2. However, if Puerto Ricans were listed according to an over-all favorable--non-favorable response, they still would fall below the Orientals because of the higher number of respondents who would limit them to categories 3 through 7. In fact, the Orientals received no score lower than 4.

Puerto Ricans received only 38 checks in category 1, while getting 62 in number 2. They also showed a reversal of trends in the next 2 categories, receiving 9 votes in 3 and 11 in category 4. One person would limit them to citizenship, and the same person who would exclude Russians from his country, would do the same to Puerto Ricans.

As noted in Tables 2 and 3, the Orientals and Puerto Ricans vary back and forth according to rater response. While receiving the same number of checks in category 1, the Orientals received more votes in categories 2 and 3, but less in category 4. They also received only 3 ratings lower than 3, while the Puerto Ricans received a total of 13 below that category.

Negroes or Blacks were given consistently the least favorable ratings, except that they received no checks lower than a 5, meaning that not one respondent was prejudiced to the degree that he wouldn't at least give a Negro citizenship in his country. Twenty-six respondents would admit Negroes to close kinship by marriage. This is interesting, especially because of the fact that only half that number or 13 persons who responded to the questionnaire were of that ethnic group. The one Oriental who returned the questionnaire gave no response to the question on Negroes, meaning that 13 "white" respondents would allow Negroes to kinship, including marriage. Seventy-five raters would only give them admittance to their club as personal chums. A reversal of progression between categories 3 and 4 is also noticed here as it was with the Puerto Rican group. Seven would allow Negroes on their street as neighbors, while 15 would only

allow them occupational proximity. Possibly, the respondents felt that those two groups had the highest visibility of any of the nine, and therefore would allow them into their occupations rather than to close proximity where they actually lived. Because of the position of the Negroes on the voter's scale, and because of their predominance in the inner-city areas under consideration, this group alone was used for the establishment of correlation tables between the Bogardus Social Distance Scale and the rest of the questionnaire. I felt that, judging from the response on this scale and general observation of American attitudes in overt form, that one's response to this one ethnic group was the best indicator of his attitudes, whether prejudiced or not.

The write-in comments on the Bogardus Social Distance Scale were varied and very interesting. Those comments most often given were as expected concerning category 1, "To close kinship by marriage." The greatest number of those gave the opinion that a person must be judged on an individual basis and not because of his race. Such statements as the following are typical: "I have no prejudice toward any race, each would have to be accepted on individual basis," and "I accept the individuals of any racial or ethnic group on the basis of their good character and amiable, amicable personality--not as a faceless member of a stereotyped or faceless group." It was interesting, though not statistically significant, that all those who wrote in comments after failing to circle some ethnic group for close kinship by marriage, were Caucasian or "white."

Two respondents justified their exclusion of some races to

close kinship by marriage on the basis that marriage between different races or cultures would not be ideal. One rater gave the following two-paragraph comment:

For reasons of cultural background, I think happy marriages are more likely to result from marriages between people of similar cultural backgrounds. Not that any race is superior to another.

My country is not U.S.A. The national policy of my country is selective immigration--a policy with which I concur for my country. This policy avoids the tremendous racial problems facing U.S.A. at the present time. Again, this is not a matter of anyone feeling "superior," but a policy of a blending of nationals of similar cultural backgrounds in general. There is much to be said in favor of this policy, when one sees the effects of racism in countries such as U.S.A. and England.

Another stated that he circled all but Negroes, "Based on Selected Messages II, pp. 42, 43." When I looked up that reference, I found that Ellen White was warning against the emotionalism that was then creeping into S.D.A. church services. What this has to do with excluding certain groups from close kinship by marriage I fail to understand.

One respondent circled all groups, but made the following statement: "I believe racial intermarriage not ideal, yet do not believe in excluding anybody because of race."

Two of those who returned the questionnaire, objected to the word willing in the directions for question 1 (see Appendix I). One said he would admit some groups to certain categories, but not willingly. Another made comments concerning the first three categories. After circling only English, Russians, and Swedes in category 1, he wrote the word "never" by the other groups. In category 2, he circled the same groups, but wrote by the others: "Possibly--but not willingly as of now." He circles all of category 3, but next to all

except the same three groups, he wrote: "But only a tithe percentage willingly."

One very interesting comment which doesn't seem to be such at first glance was the following: "I am a New Zealand citizen." However, upon looking at his responses to the Bogardus Scale, I noticed that he had included every group to close kinship by marriage except Indians and Jews; and although he included Negroes and Orientals to that category, he would not grant them citizenship in his country.

Other comments on the scale ranged from very vague and non-interpretable statements--for example, "maybe"--to the very pointed. In fact, one person who refused to even answer question 1 at all, made the following statement: "I do not share my personal prejudices."

THE QUESTIONNAIRE

The actual questionnaire consisted of 19 questions, beginning with number 2 (number 1 was the Bogardus Social Distance Scale). In this section, I will give the item analysis of the answers to each question, and then report those write-in comments which seem to be significantly relevant to the study.

Question 2 asked what the respondent felt he knew about either present or past inner-city work that had been carried on under S.D.A. auspices. Twenty-four respondents or only 18 per cent said they knew a great deal about it, 77 knew some about it, 32 knew very little and only 2 of the 135 said they knew nothing about it.

One respondent, after checking that he knew very little about

the subject said, "there isn't that much to know!" Another gave a very lengthy comment which seems to have nothing to do with the question to which it is directed:

This questionnaire is so slanted that it is impossible to give an objective answer. There are other phases of religious activity than inner-city work and this paper makes no provision for them. Inner-city work should be part of the program to carry the three angels' messages to the world. It cannot be neglected and have a well-rounded program. Inner-city work should not be neglected but neither should all-out evangelism, medical work, educational work, and publishing work be overlooked.

It sounds as if this comment should be directed toward the whole subject under consideration, but the respondent directly referenced it to question 2.

Question 3 asked where the information gained in question 2 came from. Twenty-nine respondents said that they received their information from direct involvement, 16 from hearsay, 1 from his children, (The comments of some under alternatives 5 and 6 showed that more than one received their information from their children.) and 21 from denominational publications. Forty-nine persons stated that they got their information from a combination of the alternatives; however, when the combinations were analyzed, they many times showed that more than the given alternatives were included. Consequently, they should be included in number 6, which was checked by only 17 people. Only 2 respondents knew nothing about it (see question 2).

By far, those who wrote in something on item 6, said that they had received their information from those involved. When the questionnaire was constructed, I felt alternative 2, "from hearsay," would cover this area. However, apparently those who answered the

question in this way, felt that there was a difference between direct reports from those involved and "hearsay." Some names were also mentioned as being persons involved from which the respondent got his information.⁴ Many people stated that they got their information from committees, especially a General Conference Committee on inner-city work. Others received information from church reports, from local ministerial associations, or even from the Chamber of Commerce.

Question 4 dealt with a specific project which had been carried on under the auspices of the Seventh-day Adventist Theological Seminary involving ministerial students. Since this project was included as a part of the training of young men about to enter the same profession as most of the respondents, I felt that if I was to find any very strong opinions, they would show themselves here. In essence, the question endeavored to determine whether or not each respondent was in favor of the project. Ninety-seven persons, or 72 per cent of the sample, were in favor. This is a very high percentage when it is noted that 24 respondents or 18 per cent, had not even heard of the project. This leaves only 14, of which 7 were not much concerned, 6 checked "other" or made comments, and only 1 person was against the project.

The majority of those who made comments checked item 1, "in favor of the project." Their comments, however, exposed more

⁴William Loveless, then the pastor of the Sligo Church near Washington, D.C. where active inner-city projects had been carried on, was mentioned several times. Also, L. Paytee, an administrator in Southern California, was given credit for supplying information.

reservations than a simple check would have shown. Some were concerned that the spiritual would be neglected. One man commented: "However, we should always keep in mind that we are to help men spiritually while helping them physically and emotionally." Only one respondent seemed to be concerned about the type of training the ministerial students would receive. "If it was to take the place of a regular field school of evangelism, I was against it. If in addition to field school of evangelism, then I was for it." I had expected that many more would be concerned about the type of training a project like this entailed. Other comments concerned the question of merely doing social work on the Sabbath, why a closer city had not been chosen, (The Seminary is within 100 miles of Chicago, while Washington, D.C. is over 600 miles away.) and the safety of the students in light of recent social unrest. (The Washington, D.C. riots in the spring of 1968 had taken place just a couple of months before and only a few blocks away from where the students would be working.)

Three respondents checked that they were "not much concerned" about the project. One said that "too often the wrong approach" is used, another felt the location was too far removed from the Seminary, and the third said he was not much concerned "because secular activities were done on the Sabbath." (He is incorrect, however.)

Four persons that wrote in comments had not heard about the project, but 3 of them said they would be in favor. The other respondent made a statement showing more concern: "Unless this is directed by someone--a seasoned worker--who knows what he is doing, it could be the ruin of our students. The devil is pretty subtle."

Other respondents did not check a specific answer, but just wrote in their comments. They ranged from quite positive, "interested and hopeful--the whole thrust of the church should make this response natural," to the negative, "not much of substance really done." Others felt it was up to the individual, some wanted to know more specifics-- "it was not clear they were following the counsel of Sister White," and one was concerned with what he stated was a lack of identification with the church and its goals for winning souls to Christ. He stated that the "Social Gospel without spiritual benefits doesn't do the job."

The respondents to question 5 overwhelmingly agreed--118, or 87 per cent--that Ellen White's writings give the idea that "we should be involved in inner-city work of many kinds." Seven persons checked item 2, "we should only use preaching and medical evangelism in inner-city work," 1 felt we should limit ourselves to preaching, and 1 checked "we should stay out of the cities." The remaining eight persons checked "other," or just wrote in comments.

Fifteen persons who checked item 1 also wrote in comments. Most wanted to make sure it was understood that although they felt Ellen White would approve of "many kinds of inner-city work," the spiritual must not be forgotten--it must not be divorced from "our spiritual and soul-saving activity." Others felt she would approve of the purpose and the intent, but had reservations about specific work that had been carried on. Three persons expressed concern that inner-city work be kept as only a part of the over-all program--"there are more needy persons in some rural areas than in inner-cities." One respondent checked item 1, but wanted to qualify what "many kinds"

should entail; he said it should include "combined preaching, medical, and education." Some were concerned about the types of work to be carried on. They felt that S.D.A.'s should "not supplant the Salvation Army, etc." Others felt that inner-city work should be done on an individual basis, and only by those who worked in the city, but lived outside. One person went so far as to cross out "of many kinds" and wrote in, "consult our inspired guidebook, Welfare Ministry." (see bibliography)

Two of the persons who checked item 2 also wrote in comments. They also, were concerned that inner-city work not be the main work of the church.

Five respondents checked item 5, "other." Two wanted to emphasize that "preaching" should be done, and one said that it "seems she had mixed feelings. . . for instance, Kellogg's Chicago work." (see Butler) Another stated that "there are certain political and economic issues we must stay out of or we will get sidetracked from the main one." Finally, one person apparently had also read an Ellen White statement on not duplicating the work of the Salvation Army. He said our aim should be to take the "3rd angel's message 1st," and then referred to the book, Welfare Ministry.

Those who checked no particular item were also concerned that the social not outweigh the spiritual. One inferred that Ellen White's writings could be interpreted to mean both that we should and we should not be involved in the city; and another said he wasn't sure himself, but had heard that her writings didn't "support this type of program."

The only purpose of question 6 was to determine the reliability of the sources of the information each respondent had received about inner-city work. One hundred and nineteen felt their sources to be reliable, and 12 felt some were and some were not. No one checked the item "not reliable," but three did check "other." One of these said his information was "hit and miss," another had no information, and the third said "certain aspects overemphasized--not a rounded view." One person who felt his sources were reliable wrote in: "except our publications incline to rosy reports." And one respondent who checked item 2, said he always has to sort his information.

Question 7 struck close to home. Almost all of the sample of leaders used in this study considered themselves to be ministers in the church. If they answered positively to a question on the involvement of ministers in the city, they were answering positively about their own relationships to such involvement. Ninety-four, or 70 per cent, of these leaders felt S.D.A. ministers should "be more involved." Nineteen felt they should maintain the status quo, and only one checked item 3, "not be involved in inner-city work." Seventeen checked "other," and 3 wrote in comments without checking any particular item.

A total of 34 respondents wrote comments on question seven, showing, I believe, the interest taken because the question specifically asked for information about themselves. Many of the comments were much like those reported above--a concern that the social does not outweigh the spiritual, and that a proper balance be maintained. The following statement sums up this type of comment quite well:

Every Seventh-day Adventist minister should extend himself to his fullest capabilities and not neglect any project that will make his ministry fruitful. Some are called to be evangelists, some to be teachers, some to be office workers, and some have special talents for working in the inner-city. Every worker should seek to make his ministry as well-rounded as possible.

Others felt that the congregation or laymen, more than the minister, should be involved: "Ministers should not be spread so thin in their work--others should do the greater part of the inner-city work." One person said the minister should not be involved at all, but should encourage his church members to give a portion of their time to it.

Two respondents expressed a concern for the total area of the parish:

I am disturbed by a tendency to equate "inner-city work" with work for Negroes only--this must include all--Mexican, Cuban, etc. Every minister should be involved with the complete cross section of people in his parish area.

I believe the involvement should be based on the location of the pastor's church. Many of our older suburbs are beginning to develop little ghettos and much work can be done here without going to inner-city.

Several mentioned that certain qualifications were necessary in the particular minister: "It all depends on the man, his convictions, and how he feels the Lord is leading him." Some even felt that he should not be involved at all without proper training. One specific qualification that three felt was necessary was that of not having "white" skin. They said there is a limit to the amount a white minister can do.

Question 8 was very closely related to the previous one. It asked how the ministers should be involved, if at all. The answers

were much more diversified than in previous questions. Eleven respondents felt ministers should be involved "as leaders, but away from the actual front," 55 thought they should be "fellow workers," and 48 felt they should be involved "in any way they saw fit." Fourteen checked "other" and specified their answers, while 3 wrote in comments with no item checked.

Most respondents to question 8 that wrote in comments were of the opinion that the pastor should do the leading out of inner-city programs, but that the laymen should do the actual work. They didn't like the way I had worded the alternatives---for example, some crossed out the last part of item one, showing that they felt the minister should direct, but not keep himself aloof from what was going on. Others felt that only those pastors who were near an inner-city situation should bother to become involved.

Some persons felt it was the minister's duty to "preach the Gospel" only, and be "soul winners" instead of getting involved in the city. The question, however, was not intended to exclude this aspect of the work. Possibly, a better definition of inner-city work was needed here, especially.

Two respondents again wanted to emphasize that the work should emphasize the spiritual; it should be thoroughly an S.D.A. organization "thought out for affecting lives and souls."

One man felt that ministers should be involved "like Enoch worked for the cities in his day." Apparently, he was referring to the statements made by Ellen White that Enoch worked in the cities, but lived away from them.

The emphasis on the race of the worker was again brought up. It was suggested that during violence "Whites should avoid the affected area." Another person felt that a better work can be done when ministers work for those of their own race:

I believe that the most effective work can be done when ministers in such inner-city work labor for persons of their own race--Puerto Ricans for Puerto Ricans--Negroes for Negroes--Jews for Jews and Whites for Whites.

One man who had a comment for almost every question had a long one to make concerning ministerial involvement:

An Adventist minister must use caution in joining any organization whether it is the American Medical Association, the Chamber of Commerce or the Automobile Club. It would be better if he [were] able to join other Adventists in carrying a program so as not to be distracted by side issues that other organizations might bring in. For instance, Dr. Martin Luther King promoted a non-violent program and then he got side-tracked in opposition to the war in Vietnam. Now the war in Vietnam is indefensible but the waters were muddied when his program got mixed up. A pastor should become as involved in the inner-city program as possible but should not neglect other phases of his work. He should never forget that there are people living outside the inner-city that need help also.

The ninth question really put the respondent on the spot by asking what his reaction would be if he were asked to participate in inner-city work. Sixty-one said they would become intimately involved, while 45 would help, but only in certain areas. Answers in these two categories total 106 or 78 per cent of the total. Six would be cautious about becoming involved, and only 3 would reject the invitation. Sixteen checked "other," 2 wrote in comments with no items checked, and, as with every question, the non-response factor amounted to less than 3 per cent.

Most of those who checked item 1 and wrote in comments were

concerned about their time and qualifications. If they had an ample amount of each, they were willing to become involved. One man who stated that he would become intimately involved, wanted to be sure that his family could be assured of safety.

Five respondents checked item 2 mainly because they felt their training and skills would limit them. One person who wrote "soul winning" on almost every question, said that this is the only area in which he would become involved.

Those who felt they would be cautious about becoming involved were concerned about the type and quality of the work done. One said: "Plans must be logically and carefully laid. We have sometimes rushed in too fast and done more harm than good." Another one commented: "Our primary mission is to give the 'third angel's' message, and not be the 'peace corps' or do the work of the 'Salvation Army.'"

As above, almost every person who checked "other" was concerned about his available time and ability to do a good job in such a specialized area: "Help as much as I can remembering the responsibilities of my district." One person again noted the need to get church members to work in the inner-city, "but not use the tithe⁵ money, which supports me in humanitarian work only. 'Woe is me if I preach not the Gospel.'" Others again wanted to emphasize "balance" in the overall work of the church, I was concerned that only the right

⁵A majority of Seventh-day Adventist church members tithe; that is, they pay a minimum of 10 per cent of their income for the support of the church, and its salaried clergy.

kind of person be selected for such work and another felt the Lord had "called" him to other areas of service. One respondent criticized the wording of my question: "Somewhere between strongly stated #1 and vaguely worded #2."

Those who checked no single item said they were not sure what their reactions would be to such an invitation, and that the work must be challenging to get their interest.

Question 10 offered very little chance for individual expression. It was included primarily as a tool to use for correlation. I felt there probably could be a relationship between the distance a person lived from where an inner-city project had been carried on and their attitudes toward that project. Fifty-one, or 38 per cent of the respondents lived within 10 miles of such a place, while 38 more were within 25 miles. These two categories total 89 persons or approximately two-thirds of the total sample living within 25 miles of the object of the topic under consideration. It was approximately these same persons who stated in question number 2 that they had heard at least some about inner-city projects, giving some degree of justification to my decision to use a stratified sample on the basis of geographical area. Nine checked that they lived within 50 miles from such a project, 12 lived only within 100 miles, 16 lived more than 100 miles away, and 9 did not know of any such projects.

The next question assumed some degree of knowledge of the writings of Mrs. Ellen G. White; but in light of the place of prominence that she holds in the S.D.A. Church, I did not feel it was too

presumptuous to assume such sophistication on the part of this sample of church leaders, especially since they are, in the main, also ministers. The question asked how Ellen White would react to the inner-city projects if she were alive today to see them carried on. Twenty-five felt she would highly approve, 71 felt she would approve, only 2 felt she would not be much concerned, 6 felt she would disapprove, and 29 checked "other" or wrote in comments.

Many more comments were written on this question than on any previous one. By far, those checking "other," stated that Ellen White would "urge intensification" of inner-city work. One respondent said that she would urge more to be done, more support given, and better methods employed. Others noted that she would be disappointed in our neglect of the inner-cities, and "would condemn the smallness of vision and feebleness of effort."

Quite a few comments were written in so as to inform me that both alternatives 2 (approve) and 4 (disapprove) needed to be checked, for 2 different reasons: (1) she would approve of some projects and disapprove of others, and (2) she would approve of the idea, purpose, et cetera, but disapprove of the methods, type of work conducted, and not keeping this type of work in balance with other types--mainly "soul-winning" and "preaching the Gospel." Some especially felt she would disapprove of the activities that were done on the Sabbath--"many projects border on Sabbath breaking"--but this topic will be covered in question 20. One felt she would approve of most, but disapprove of the "trend of social emphasis only so prevalent among some groups."

A few respondents felt they were incapable of knowing how Ellen White would respond to inner-city projects. One person stated: "I am no judge for E. G. White and she is no judge."

Finally, two persons wanted to criticize my question. One wrote "irrelevant question," and another said, "This is a structured question and very poor."

Since those most often involved in that work in the inner-cities which has been carried out under S.D.A. auspices have been those in the church's educational institutions, I wanted to know how the leaders felt about that involvement. Question 12 asked if they approved. One hundred and eight, for 80 per cent of the total sample, said they approved. Nine did not know, and only three persons said that the schools should not be involved. One had no opinion, eight checked "other," and 3 wrote in comments without checking any one item.

Most of those who made comments had checked item 1 but were concerned that the students should be involved in a well-planned program with adequate and competent supervision. The following statement is typical: "It depends on quality and leadership and effectiveness and planning as well as actual commitment and know-how of participants."

Again, many were concerned more about the balance of the whole church mission than with answering the question at hand. "Good experience--not only work to be done," "some, but all the world needs help," "They should also be involved in medical, publishing and evangelistic work," and "Again, with balance--the American inner-

cities are not the sole or even the main responsibility of the S.D.A Church"--such comments sum up most of the others along the same line of thought.

A few respondents felt that only those schools which are located near to a city should be involved; one person did not want such activity to be compulsory, and a few anticipated question 13 by noting that only "mature" students should be involved. Other comments included a respondent who said "the first job of our schools is to train our own young people," and a man who put an exclamation mark after the "Yes" or item one.

Question 13 asked what level of students the leaders felt should be involved. Two felt only the ministerial students in the denomination's seminary should be included, 3 more checked only the universities, 5 would include only colleges, and none would limit involvement only to academies or grade schools. Eighty, or 59 per cent felt a combination of the schools should be used, and 40 felt all should be included. Only 2 persons felt none of the schools should be involved in inner-city projects. This, of course, shows a discrepancy with question 12, where 6 respondents said our schools should not be involved.

Of the eighty persons who felt a combination of the levels should be involved, 25 checked categories 1 through 4, 17 checked 1 through 3, 10 only wanted universities and colleges, 8 would include categories 2 through 4, 6 would only use colleges and academies, and 2 persons would limit involvement to the seminary and the universities. Two persons checked item 6, but did not specify which combination

they would choose.

The comments showed most of the same concerns noted on question 12; for instance, proper guidance is needed, the school must be in the proper setting, and the students must be mature and of "high quality"--two wrote in "qualified" and "church members." One person did not want to limit himself to any categories of students so wrote in his own: "medical, educational, ministerial." Another, concerned as he was in other comments about too much emphasis on one area of "the work," made the following statement:

Wherever there is a need that the school can serve, then whatever level the school may be, the students should be encouraged by precept and example to pitch in and help whether it is inner-city or outer-city.

The next question was quite pointed and assumed that one had a fair idea of what the "mission" of the S.D.A. Church is. My feeling was that most S.D.A.'s would probably agree that the church's mission is to "preach the Gospel to all the world," to "tell the world of Christ," or to demonstrate to the world what some have termed "the truth about God." Each one makes the whole world the "mission field," and as such, must include the city. The question, then, asked if inner-city work was necessary as a part of the mission of the church. One hundred twenty-three (91 per cent), the highest number agreeing on any one question, said that it was necessary. Seven were not sure, 3 said no, and 2 elected to write in comments without committing themselves to a specific answer.

Almost all of the comments on question 14 were just elaborations to a check on item 1. Some justified their answers by saying

that the S.D.A. message is for everyone, others felt inner-city work necessary only if the method used was preaching, and a few who had emphasized "balance" before, here again wanted to limit inner-city work to one phase of the mission.

One man thought that inner-city work was not necessary as a collective project, but "only as personal Christian contacts." Another agreed that the work was necessary, but was "not sure the present plan is it;" and one person thought that the plan should be to work the cities from outside. A Black respondent just wrote down a quote to express his feelings: "Say unto the cities. . . behold, your God."

Question 15, I suppose, was even more presumptuous than 11. It gave each respondent the opportunity to project Christ's attitudes toward the inner-city. Eighty-four, or 62 per cent, said Christ would "help the poor in the inner-city in any way possible." No one checked item 2, "attempt to heal them of physical disease only," but 33 felt Christ would "preach to them while attempting to heal them physically and emotionally. Only 4 respondents did not think Christ would get involved in the social problems of the inner-city. No one checked either item 5 or 6, showing that they did not feel Christ would bypass the poor or their problems for what might be "more important work." Nine persons checked "other" and 2 wrote in comments without checking any particular item.

As expected, many of those who wrote in comments on question 15 emphasized over and over that Christ would keep clear of both social and political issues. One person wrote: "Christ ministered to the

individual! It was not a social gospel or a social action effect per se. His kingdom was not of this world. Others, also concerned about undue emphasis on the social to the neglect of the spiritual, wrote again that there are other areas just as important and that this type of work is only important when the objective is to "give the Gospel." The opposite end of the spectrum was voiced by a few who said Christ would employ every means "to bring them physically, spiritually and socially into His kingdom."

One man avoided the question by saying that he thought Christ "would do about as He did when He was here approximately 2000 years ago." Another said Christ would "help the poor to help themselves."

Finally, 2 persons wanted to criticize the question: "I think these are pretty leading questions," and "This is irrelevant."

The response to the next question came as a surprise to me, probably because I thought it was a pretty simple question; it really turned out to be quite difficult to answer. I wanted the answers to be on the basis of whether Christ will come no matter whether or not any work is done in the inner-city. However, many people decided that even if the S.D.A. Church does nothing, someone else will do the work. Consequently, the answers probably do not measure an attitude very closely. However, I will report the item analysis anyway; maybe the comments will throw a little light on the attitudes of the respondents. Ninety-one, or 67 per cent, felt that Christ will come in spite of S.D.A. neglect of the cities; 12 did not know, 24 said that He would not come. Five wrote in comments without checking any of the alternatives.

As stated above, many felt that if the S.D.A. Church did not work in the city, some other group would--and that group would also reap the "reward," while S.D.A.'s would "have to pay the price for neglect" because "their blood will be on our hands." One man, after checking item 1, wrote: "'The very stones will cry out' if we don't." Two persons again emphasized that only "preaching" is needed, apparently not feeling that inner-city work would include it.

The response I had expected was voiced quite strongly by those who read question 16 the way I wrote it. A typical answer was, "All must hear the Gospel." One person just wrote, "Jonah had to work in Nineveh," and another criticized the church for leaving the cities before "the work" is finished: "We talk about leaving the cities--we must not leave till the work in the cities is completed--Christ is not coming until we do the work we are here to do."

Another person said he did not want to second-guess Christ, one did not think the question was "sound," and finally one respondent just wrote, "foolish question."

Question 17 was very subjective in that it asked the respondent to evaluate the majority of the inner-city programs as to their worth. Only 2 felt they are a waste of time, 3 thought them to be worthwhile only to those in the ghetto, 1 felt the workers involved received the only good from them, and 86 checked that they are "what our Savior would want us to do." Twenty-nine checked "other," and 8 wrote only comments.

One of the 3 persons who checked item 2, "worthwhile only to those in the ghetto," was not sure the projects were even worthwhile in

this capacity. He wrote: "and not too much here even."

Again, there were those who were concerned that this work not overshadow other work "just as important." One person wrote that "there is a world beyond the ghetto."⁶ Others who answered that inner-city work is "what our Savior would want us to do" had comments like the following to make: "if the purpose is to lead souls to Christ," "Some of it is! Needs more study and planning," and "Needs to be stepped up."

On this question more than any other, the respondents checked the alternative "other." Most of those who chose item 5, did so only to note that they would have liked to choose both 2 and 3, because it is "good for workers and ghetto people," or "of value to those who serve and those who are served." Again, many were concerned that preaching be included in the total program, because this is only "one aspect of God's work in the world." Many said they did not know enough about the work to judge, and even if they did they were "not sure we have any way of measuring success or failure."

One person, who seemed to be in agreement with all those who advocated more extensive work in the city, was concerned that a higher quality of workers be involved. He said the programs were "In need of born again selfless Christians whose reflection of Christ will be unmistakable." Another also was concerned that emphasis on the city be stepped up, but was not sure how it could be done effectively.

⁶Inner-city certainly would not exclude all but the ghetto, but apparently this person did not make the distinction. See Chamberlain, "Our Mission to the Cities," Insight, II (August 10, 1971), 19-20.

He wrote: "Do you have any suggestions? Please send them to us-- soon!"

Finally, a respondent seemed to be saying something to me as an educator: "Talked of too much by educators but not unselfishly supported. Dorcas societies, welfare workers, physicians, missionaries have set the Adventist Church a fine example."

Question 18 was another question included mainly for the purposes of correlation. I felt there might be those who lived close to a city where minority groups were substantially represented; but who still might not be close to an area where an S.D.A. sponsored project had been carried on, or at least might not have been aware of one. Twenty-one respondents lived in such an area, 57 lived less than 10 miles from one, 33 lived 10 to 25 miles from one, 10 lived between 25 and 50 miles away, 6 lived between 50 and 100 miles away, and 6 were over 100 miles from where minority groups were represented.

I wanted to include a question which could be used for comparison with question 9 if the need arose. Consequently, I formed one very much like number 9, but which would more likely measure motivation. The first question had tried to measure motivation of the respondent when asked to participate; number 19 only requested that he express what his actions would be if an inner-city project were set up near him. The answers were placed, as they were in most of the other questions, on a continuum from the most negative to the most positive-- or the reverse. As expected, only one person would speak out against the project, 17 would be indifferent, and 22 would become involved, but very sparingly. A full 70 persons said they would "be willing to

spend several hours per week on the project." Twenty-one persons checked "other," and 3 wrote in comments without checking any item.

Over 30 respondents to this question wrote in that their responsibilities in other areas limited their availability in terms of time; otherwise they would become involved (many would become involved anyway, but on a limited basis.). Almost all of the other comments concerned the type of program that would be initiated. Some would help if the program was "balanced," others if it was of the type "that deserved approbation," one if the work was "meaningful," and another if "the project ultimately led to souls being won to Christ." A few noted that they felt the question was a duplicate of question 9. At least they were awake, if not very discerning.

The last question, number 20, was the one I expected would receive the most adamant responses and the most comments written in. Such proved to be the case. Fifty persons approved openly of inner-city work being done on the Sabbath by S.D.A.'s; 10 approved, but didn't want to "stir up others" with their opinions, 12 had no feelings either way, and 22 disapproved. Forty--more than in any other question--wrote in comments without checking any of the given alternatives; and only one person did not even answer the question.

The comments on this question were so numerous--more than half of the respondents wrote something--that I feel the only way to present them is in order of the item number checked. Most of those who checked item 1, "approve openly," also showed a concern about the type of activity carried on during the Sabbath hours. They approve, but of the type of work appropriate for the Sabbath: "of the type of

which is appropriate for Sabbath-keeping. There are types which should be limited to week days," "This would depend on if this lifts the ox out of the ditch." and "I feel some projects could be handled on other days more appropriately than on Sabbath." Some, although they approved, did not go along with all the types of projects that had been done on the Sabbath. One man wrote, "But not with all that has been done on the Sabbath. As Jesus did so must we, even in the inner-cities teach people right Sabbath keeping." Another stated that "there are areas of recreation that. . . we should avoid;" and one said, "some phases need study." Finally a respondent wrote, "I do not give blank o.k. to any Sabbath activities."

Only 2 of those who preferred not to stir up others' feelings wrote in comments. One wrote in that he approved "of doing certain things on the Sabbath," and the other said, "approve--but leave out the sports on Sabbath."

Those who checked item three, "have no feelings either way," also were not prone to write in comments. One gave the most common answer, "depends on what kind of work they are doing," another felt that, "Sabbath inner-city work should be of a different type than weekday inner-city work," a third didn't have enough information to make a decision, and the last one just wrote, "personal matter."

A majority of those who did not approve of Sabbath inner-city work wrote in comments to explain or justify their decision. Most said they disapproved of "secular" subjects being taught on the Sabbath: "I do not approve the teaching of subjects of a secular nature on the Sabbath," and "I think that some subjects such as physical

education should not be taught on Sabbath," are typical. Some were disturbed that this type of work couldn't be done on a weekday, "Plenty of time to do work in six days," others wanted only the "preaching of the Gospel" to be done on Sabbath, and only one person showed concern for the impression the church would make on those who were being helped. He wrote: "We need to be very careful how we teach other people what the Sabbath means to us. There is so much good we can do on the Sabbath without even touching the "gray" areas.

Almost all of those who checked no alternative, felt that their answer depended on the type of activity done on the Sabbath. They felt that "house-painting," "physical education," et cetera, were best done on other days of the week. Three typical comments are:

I approve, but feel strongly that the Sabbath work should reflect a consciousness of the holy day. Truly converted Christians would not blur the real issues.

That depends on whether the work can be done some other time. In Washington, D.C. the students of Columbia Union College and Takoma Academy are involved in inner-city work on the Sabbath. This is the Urban Service Corps. There are non-Adventist schools involved in the same program but on the other days of the week. If non-Adventist schools can teach remedial reading and arithmetic, etc. to underprivileged children on weekdays then why can't Adventists? Why teach the children secular work on Sabbath that can be done on weekdays? This example teaches these children that should they become Adventists and attend Adventist schools it would be perfectly proper to study chemistry, or what have you, on Sabbath, since that is what they are doing now in the elementary grades.

Some modification of "secular" activities would be in order. This would not scuttle the whole plan, nor even the Sabbath part of the plan. It would let people know we recognize a difference between weekdays and Sabbaths. If the time comes for people to be brought into the church, we wouldn't have so much to undo if our Sabbath keeping example had been above question. In other words, we should set an example, that those for whom we are working can safely follow.

Two respondents apparently approved, for they both paraphrased Matthew 12:12 by writing, "Is it lawful to do good on the Sabbath day?" Another, although he approved, was concerned about how the projects were carried on. He said, "Some are excellent and some are or have been in left field." He continued to write that the work "must represent our beliefs and what Christ would approve of." Finally, one person wrote an answer which is good advice in any circumstances: "Good judgment needs to be exercised."

GENERAL COMMENTS

There were so many comments that were not directed specifically to one question, that I felt a few should be included so that the reader might be able to more accurately assess the general feeling of the respondents. Six of these comments are copied below:

1. Inner-city work is a vital need. Some in the church are inclined to forget the specific task given the church--giving the Gospel to all peoples in these days. A social gospel by itself will not in itself better the people--but a properly combined evangelistic and spiritual program along with a social gospel is the true answer.

2. I think in some cases workers have forgotten the objective of bringing Christ to the masses. We will do little to change this world, but we can prepare people for the next world. Our responsibility as I see it is to--

1. Help people live in as healthy a way as possible.
2. Help people become financially independent. (I might add that I have little or no use for a man who wants something for nothing. I have had experience hiring and working with these inner-city minority people and many want a job and pay but don't want to work.)
3. Bring the love of God and the message of salvation to all.
4. Help them secure an education. Very important.

3. The big hang-up with this survey is one's definition of inner-city work. It is of course according to knowledge.

I believe fully in supporting inner-city work dealing with medical, spiritual and basic welfare needs.

I am against one church getting involved with battles about air pollution, water pollution, job training, public school problems, housing authority, and building projects. S.D.A. social workers as such should study and work in these areas. It would be good for academy and college students to be acquainted with and involved with these problems, if their course of study is connected to these problem areas. A minister has no business getting involved in demonstrations and problems of this nature to which he has not been called and could do little or nothing about.

I am also against the demands of those who want to collect money through offerings or donations to take the place of clothing distribution through our welfare set up for the poor.

4. If carried on with the objective to win souls--otherwise it becomes a service without a purpose to add children for the kingdom. I understand some of this work is carried on without identifying S.D.A. sponsorship--religious instruction is not considered to be part of the program.

5. I feel there is a work to be accomplished in the I.C.⁷ I further feel that not every one's interest lies in that area as relating to aggressive work any more than all are interested in P.R., or temperance, or Rel. Lib.⁸ Some are better at public evangelism than pastoral work. But we are interested in the total program.

My reaction to one local program is this: the pastor from the other conference used the meetings of I.C. to slam our churches and supposed attitudes so I just lost interest in any cooperative venture with him.

6. What specifically do you mean by "inner-city work?" Naturally we must be involved in the winning of souls and in humanitarian endeavors if it is done our way. We cannot involve ourselves with most of the public efforts at social reform without becoming adversely affected ourselves and losing our identity. We have a distinctive message and whatever we do ought to be compatible to it.

⁷ Inner-city

⁸ Public Relations and Religious Liberty are administrative offices in the S.D.A. Church.

PERSONAL CHARACTERISTICS

A total of 21 items were included in question 21, "personal characteristics." Four of those items, (1) age, (2) sex, (3) race, and (4) marital status, were reported in Chapter III.

A majority of the denominations' leaders have been employed by the church for over 20 years: 15 per cent had only been working for the S.D.A. Church for from 0 to 9 years, 19 per cent from 10 to 19 years, 39 per cent from 20 to 29 years, 23 per cent from 30 to 39 years, and 4 per cent had been in denominational service for over 40 years. This means that 66 per cent, or almost two-thirds, of the S.D.A. Church's leaders have served that institution for 20 years or more.

Most of the respondents had either 2 or 3 children--58 per cent. The rest were divided almost equally between those with only 1, and those with 4 or more. By far the majority of these children--66 per cent--were of secondary school age or older.

Almost all of the sample--94 per cent--had attended an S.D.A. school at one level or another. Most had not attended an S.D.A. grade school (54 per cent), but had attended an S.D.A. secondary school (60 per cent). All but 9 per cent had attended one of the church's colleges, while only 21 per cent had attended an S.D.A. university. Thirty-five per cent went to the denomination's seminary.

Almost two-thirds (64 per cent) of S.D.A. leaders majored in theology in college, while only 31 per cent said they majored in that subject in graduate school. Other prominent majors in college were

business, history, and education. On the graduate level speech also figured among the major interests of the leaders. One interesting factor was that 58 per cent of the respondents had not taken any graduate education.

Fifty-eight of the leaders had attended a non-S.D.A. school at some time in their career. Of these, 18 attended one of these schools during college, 22 at the master's degree level, and 12 at the doctoral level. Three had taken some other degree at a non-denominational school. Thirty-one attended for 1 year or less, while 26 stayed for more than 1 year. Two-thirds took this education before 1960. Only 19 had taken some schooling at an non-S.D.A. institution during the last 10 years.

To get some idea how close the respondents were to the major S.D.A. sponsored inner-city projects, I asked what denominational conference each person was a member of. In the Columbia Union (Ohio to New Jersey to Virginia), 4 per cent were from Allegheny East (Negroes in the Columbia Union), 4 per cent were from Chesapeake (mainly the state of Maryland), 30 per cent were from Potomac (mainly Virginia, Washington, D.C. and the southern portion of Maryland). In the Lake Union (that area around Lake Michigan), 7 per cent were from Illinois, 3 per cent from Indiana, 16 per cent from Michigan, and 4 per cent from the Lake Region (Negroes in the Lake Union). The Pacific Union (California, Hawaii, Nevada-Utah, and Arizona) sample included only respondents from the Southern California Conference (18 per cent) and the Southeastern California Conference (7 per cent).

Twenty-five per cent gave their position of employment as

General Conference level, 16 per cent were at the union conference level, 23 per cent were employed by a local conference, 30 per cent were local pastors, and 4 per cent checked "other" (Bible teachers, editors, et cetera). This item analysis does not give a true picture, however, of the response. It should be remembered that approximately 50 persons each were included in the sample of General Conference, union conference, and local conference leaders, while 150 local pastors were included. Consequently, the response is highly weighted toward the upper end of the scale.

CHAPTER VI

A CHI-SQUARE ANALYSIS OF RELATIONSHIPS AMONG VARIOUS ASPECTS OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE

A number of cross-tabulations on various aspects of the questionnaire--the scale, some specific questions, and certain personal characteristics--were run to determine what relationships or effects one aspect might have with or on another. Some proved to be significant (at the .05 level or better) or at least showed significant differences between observed and expected frequencies; others did not, but some are interesting because of their non-significance. Some aspects, where the level of significance is in question, still show many very interesting trends.

INTERRELATIONSHIPS OF PERSONAL CHARACTERISTICS AND EXPRESSED ATTITUDES

I felt that those respondents who had children would probably know more about the inner-city projects carried on under S.D.A. auspices than those who did not, due to the fact that it has been the denomination's educational institutions which have been involved in such projects. The chi-square analysis showed my suspicions to be correct. There is a definite trend toward more knowledge with an increase in the number of children the respondent reported. Those who reported only one child knew less than expected about the inner-

city projects,¹ while those with three knew more. Another table showed the probable reason for the above. Those with only one child tended to get their information more from direct involvement or hearsay than would be expected; those with two or three children received their information from a combination of the alternatives, including their own children. However, the number of children a respondent had showed no relationship to his attitudes toward question 4, the seminary involvement in the project in Washington, D.C.

INTERRELATIONSHIPS OF PERSONAL CHARACTERISTICS AND THE BOGARDUS SOCIAL DISTANCE SCALE

One of the most interesting aspects of the study I thought would be the relationships uncovered between the personal characteristics of the respondents and their attitudes as expressed on the Bogardus Social Distance Scale. I felt that since Negroes were the most prominent ethnic group to be found in the inner-city--and the United States as a whole for that matter--and since they were consistently given the lowest ratings on the scale, that to use them for the comparisons between personal characteristics and the scale would serve the purposes of this research.

A comparison between the age of the respondent and the social distance scale showed an expected trend--the younger a person is, the

¹This can probably be accounted for by the age level of the respondents. Most "only children" of this age level of respondents are probably above the age which would still be attending an S.D.A. educational institution.

more he tends to be liberal on the question of race relations. However, this study showed a finding which I had not expected. The progression of liberality extends downward only to the 30 to 44 age group when the question is one of marriage. However, the 29 and under age group would permit Negroes to category 2, "To my club as personal chums," more than would be expected, while those older answered affirmatively to this category at the rate either at or lower than what might be expected statistically.

The chi-square which used race as the variable was the most significant of any one run.² Of course, while the number of Negroes which would allow Negroes "To close kinship by marriage" was much higher than the expected values, one must remember that those values are based on statistical expectation. Anyone, on the basis of common sense, would agree that more Negroes would marry other Negroes than might be shown on a table of expected frequencies. However, even though the number of Caucasians who would marry Negroes was less than the statistical expected frequency (13 observed to 22 expected), I was very surprised to note that even 13 would consent to admit Negroes "To close kinship by marriage." This is almost 10 per cent of the total response and even more than that amount when only the Caucasian population is considered.

A comparison of the social distance scale with the years of

² Significant at the .001 level. Because of a large amount of small numbered cells, that level is distorted; however, when the chi-square table was collapsed for that distortion, the level of significance still was .01 or greater.

service a respondent had spent in denominational service again showed that the younger (at least in time of service) a person is, the more likely he is to permit Negroes to close kinship by marriage. One interesting factor which emerged from this comparison was that those in the category of 10 to 19 years of service who would limit Negroes to their occupation and no closer was almost twice as high as might be expected statistically.

Although the number of children a respondent had was not significant, the age which those children were at the time of the questionnaire does show a trend; the level of significance, however, is low. Those with children in college or below would allow marriage with Negroes more than expected, while those with children over college age would allow such close kinship less than expected frequency.

Whether or not a respondent attended an S.D.A. school or not made no difference in his attitudes statistically. Only a slight trend could be noticed from the chi-squares run--if he went to an S.D.A. school he might be slightly less apt to restrict Negroes to the second level or below. The level of education which the respondent took in an S.D.A. institution also made no difference except for the ones who went to the denomination's seminary. There seems to be a trend toward more openness to ethnic groups by those who did attend the seminary. Major subjects of study made very little difference either; however, those interested in theology seemed more open than those who majored in business, education, or history.

Whether or not a person attended a non-S.D.A educational

institution made no difference in his attitudes toward Negroes. The only trend that I could see might be worth noting is that those who attended a non-S.D.A. college were more likely to limit Negroes to the fourth category than those who took higher degrees at schools outside the church. Also, he was more apt to allow Negroes to close kinship by marriage if he had attended a non-S.D.A. institution for one or more years than if the time he spent there was less than one year. Another interesting factor which I expected would emerge was that there is a trend for those who attended a school not in the denomination prior to 1950 to be less apt to allow Negroes to come "too close" than those who went to such schools from 1950 to 1970.

A comparison of the social distance scale with the local conference where a respondent kept his church membership proved to be very interesting. There were two "Black" conferences which, of course, showed that they would allow Negroes to close kinship by marriage more often than statistically expected; however, although I expected every "White" conference to show a less than expected frequency on category 1, I was proven wrong. Although only slightly higher, the Potomac Conference showed the only value which was above the expected frequency for the first category, "to close kinship by marriage." This is especially interesting in light of the fact that most of those whose employment is at the General Conference level have their local church membership in the Potomac Conference. When position of employment was considered, those at the General Conference level again showed more openness, but only slightly.

INTERRELATIONSHIPS OF EXPRESSED ATTITUDES AND
THE BOGARDUS SOCIAL DISTANCE SCALE

A comparison of the social distance scale with question 7 showed a response I had expected. Those who felt that ministers should be more involved in inner-city work also showed a trend toward a more open attitude toward close relationships with Negroes than did those who felt ministers should not be involved.

The same phenomenon emerged with question 9, but on a much more significant level. Those who said they would "become intimately involved" in inner-city work if asked, would allow Negroes "to close kinship by marriage" much more often than statistically expected and also much more often than would those who would limit their participation. The same trend was noticed with a corollary question, number 19.

The next comparison, although less significant statistically, was also interesting. It showed a trend toward more liberal attitudes the closer the respondent lived to the locality where an S.D.A.-sponsored inner-city project had been carried on. A comparison with question 18, which was included somewhat as a check on question 10 showed the same trend.

A comparison was also run between question 20--whether or not the respondent approved of inner-city work on the Sabbath--and the social distance scale. Here again, the same trend can be seen: more willingness to admit Negroes to close kinship by marriage with those who approve of such work, and less willingness than expected by those

who disapprove.

INTERRELATIONSHIPS OF SOME OF THE EXPRESSED
ATTITUDES WITH OTHERS

A comparison was made between certain questions and others which I felt might show statistical significance, or at least some interesting trends.

The first was run between question 9--whether the respondent would participate in inner-city work if asked--and question 10--the distance he lived from where an "Adventist inner-city project" had been carried on. As I was sure would be true, many more persons who lived close to such a project would become intimately involved than would those who lived further away. However, it can be noted that even more of those who live close than would be expected statistically, would be involved in this work. This probably shows a feeling of emotional closeness on the part of those who are also geographically close.

A comparison of questions 9 and 18 showed almost the opposite. Those living further away--up to 25 miles--would be more apt to become involved in inner-city work than would those who live right in the center--or within 10 miles--of a city where minority groups are represented.

Question 4--attitudes toward ministerial student involvement in Washington, D.C.--was compared with question 20--whether or not the respondent approved of inner-city work on the Sabbath. As I thought would be the case, most of those who were in favor of the Washington

project also approved openly of such work being carried out on the Sabbath; even more than might be expected statistically gave favorable responses to both questions.

INTERRELATIONSHIPS OF SOME OF THE PERSONAL CHARACTERISTICS WITH OTHERS

I felt that some comparisons of certain of the personal characteristics, although not directly related to attitudes, might be beneficial for a better understanding of the whole research project. Mainly, I wanted to compare the position of employment a respondent held to other of his characteristics; but I did include one other comparison--that of attendance at a non-S.D.A. school and age. The observed and expected frequencies show that those 29 years of age and under are more likely not to have attended a non-S.D.A. educational institution while those 60 and over are more likely to have attended such a school than would be expected statistically.

The rest of the comparisons were done with the position of employment of the respondent as one variable in each case. The first compared sex, and showed--but not at a significant level--that more of the female respondents are at the highest level than would be expected.

The second comparison used age and showed quite significantly that the younger the leader is the more likely he is to be a pastor,

³This is assuming there are levels of employment in the church and that the General Conference is the highest.

and that the older he is the more likely he will have a position on a higher level. The same showed itself to be true at a very significant level when years of denominational service was compared with level of position.

A comparison of race with position of employment showed no significance statistically; the only real difference between observed and expected frequencies had to do with Negroes' position as pastors--they are more likely than would be statistically expected to be pastors and less likely to be at the General Conference level.

When attendance at the seminary and position of employment were compared, the findings were quite significant; those who have attended the denomination's seminary are much more likely to be pastors than they are to hold either local or union conference positions. The corollary is also true--those in these positions are less likely than would be expected to have attended the seminary. Those at the General Conference level, however, do not follow the trend: those who did and did not attend are both represented in those positions at the frequency which could be expected.

A comparison of college major and level of position was also run, showing that theology majors were represented less often at the General Conference level than might be expected and more often at the local pastor level. Just the opposite was true for business majors. The university major showed somewhat the same trend: theology majors were more often at the local pastor level than would be expected statistically.

When attendance at a non-S.D.A. school was used as the other

variable, it was fairly obvious that, although not significant, those who had attended non-S.D.A. educational institutions were disproportionately represented at the General Conference level. I felt that this could be due to the fact that many of those who have attended non-S.D.A. schools have done so seeking advanced degrees which might have qualified them for a certain position of leadership. Such proved to be the case when I compared position of employment with the highest educational level obtained at a non-S.D.A. school.

CHAPTER VII

HOW ARE ATTITUDES CHANGED?

Attitudes do change. Many change radically within just a few minutes, while others may require years of continuous bombardment. Many times they change as a result of external alteration, but also because of internal developments. Learning from one's life experiences causes attitudes to change and to fluctuate with each new confrontation. As a result, behavior may also undergo revision.

I will limit the following discussion on attitude change to only two different approaches. The reader certainly should not assume that these two theories exhaust the literature on the subject. However, they are representative of the best research that has been carried on to date.

THE AFFECTIVE-COGNITIVE CONSISTENCY THEORY

Milton Rosenberg has done research mainly concerned with what happens within the person when his attitudes change; and especially with the correspondence in change between the affective and cognitive attitudinal components.

The affective element of the attitude is the positive or negative feelings that the individual has toward the attitude object; while the cognitive element is the "person's beliefs about the potentialities of the object of attitude for the realization or

blocking of valued states."¹ In language more suited for the layman, he might conceive of the cognitive element in terms of beliefs about the relations between the attitude object and other values of the person. So, his principle hypothesis would be that the nature and strength of the feeling toward an attitude object are correlated with the beliefs associated with it.

Strong and stable positive affect toward a given object should be associated with beliefs that it leads to the attainment of a number of important values, while strong negative affect should be associated with beliefs that the object tends to block the attainment of important values. Similarly, moderate positive or negative affects should be associated with beliefs that relate the attitude object either to less important values or, if to important values, then with less confidence about the relationships between these values and the attitude object.²

One could say that the principle of Rosenberg's theory is wrapped up in the concept of affective-cognitive consistency. He says it this way:

When the affective and cognitive components of an attitude are mutually consistent the attitude is in a stable state; when the affective and cognitive components are mutually inconsistent (to a degree that exceeds the individual's present tolerance for such inconsistency) the attitude is in an unstable state and will undergo spontaneous reorganizing activity until such activity eventuates in either (1) the attainment of affective-cognitive consistency, or (2) the placing of an "irreconcilable" inconsistency beyond the range of active awareness.³

His argument is that if one's affect or feeling about an

¹John T. Doby, Introduction to Social Psychology (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1966), p. 301.

²M. J. Rosenberg, "An Analysis of Affective-Cognitive Consistency," in his Attitude Organization and Change (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1960), p. 18.

³Ibid., p. 22.

object is based upon the position of a value in a personal value system, then the strength of the associated affect will change with what he calls the "perceived instrumentality" of the attitude object for attaining the value. He has used several methods for demonstrating these relationships, but a reconstruction of such models would entail much more detail than the scope of this paper allows.

Suffice it to say that his studies have shown that strong positive feeling toward an object of attitude should be associated with the beliefs that it will and does lead to the achievement of values that are important, and negative affect toward an object with the beliefs that it will block or interfere with the maintenance or attainment of these values.⁴

THE COGNITIVE DISSONANCE THEORY

Probably the most familiar term in the field of social psychology to the layman is "cognitive dissonance." Since Leon Festinger proposed the theory, it has become almost common language to anyone who is discussing any ideas, beliefs, opinions, or the like, which for some reason do not fit together. The theory itself, of course, is much more complex, and it is the purpose of the following section to explain it more thoroughly.

Cognition to Festinger, is "any knowledge, opinion, or belief about the environment, about oneself, or about one's behavior."⁵

⁴Doby, p. 301.

⁵Festinger, A Theory of Cognitive Dissonance (Evanston: Row, Peterson, 1957), p. 3.

Cognitions are thoughts, verbal statements, or symbols which describe aspects of experience and reality. Festinger would say that these elements of cognition are responsive to reality and by and large, map reality. This is quite obvious when someone shows by his behavior, that he is out of touch with reality. This would suggest, then, that even though it is constantly changing, there is a common consensus about aspects of reality, and a person not "in touch" will have pressures exerted upon him to reduce the variance between the cognitive element and the "true" meaning of reality.

Dissonance refers to the relations that exist between pairs of elements. They must be related, for if they aren't, then one implies nothing for the other. However, they become dissonant when they do not fit together; or in Festinger's own words: "two elements are in a dissonant relation if, considering these two alone, the obverse of the one element would follow the other,"⁶ for example, a person with heart disease who continues to smoke even though he knows it is detrimental to his health.

Festinger lists four sources from which dissonance may originate:⁷

1. Dissonance can arise from logical inconsistency. However, to psychologically experience it, one would have to become or be made aware of the inconsistency.

2. Dissonance may arise because of cultural mores. For example, if someone sitting at your side in church tries to talk to you during the sermon, the knowledge of what he is doing is dissonant with your knowledge of what he is expected to do. The

⁶Ibid., p. 13.

⁷Ibid., p. 14.

dissonance exists because the culture defines what is consonant and what is not.

3. Dissonance may arise because one specific opinion is subsumed under a more general opinion and the two are not consistent in their behavioral implications. An example is a southern Democrat who votes Republican. "Being a Democrat" includes, as part of its meaning, favoring Democratic candidates.

4. Dissonance may arise because of past experience. If a person who can sense pain pricks himself with a pin and does not sense anything, then these two cognitions are dissonant since he knows from experience that pain is supposed to follow a pin prick or cut.

He notes, that in any of the above situations, there might be many other elements of cognition that are consonant with either of the elements that might be under consideration.

The theory of cognitive dissonance can be very helpful when one is studying the relationships between attitudes and the person's actual behavior, especially since Festinger has shown that there is a tendency toward consistency between cognitions and behavior. Most researchers are aware that one's behavior does not always prove to be consistent with his expressed attitudes. The theory of cognitive dissonance takes this into account by noting the conditions under which attitudes and behavior do not correspond. If his behavior is inconsistent with his stated beliefs or expressed attitudes, then the verbal statements are deceptive. Otherwise, his behavior and cognitions are actually dissonant.

The question is, What happens when even a person's cognitions are discrepant? These cognitions then create tension which the person strives to reduce by making them more consistent. The tension, Festinger calls cognitive dissonance, and the drive toward consistency

he calls dissonance reduction. He states:⁸

1. The existence of dissonance, being psychologically uncomfortable, will motivate the person to try to reduce the dissonance and achieve consonance.

2. When dissonance is present, in addition to trying to reduce it, the person will actively avoid situations and information which would likely increase the dissonance.

If two elements are dissonant, the dissonance can be reduced or even eliminated by changing one element so it is consistent with the other one. This can be accomplished in several ways, but it depends on what type of cognitive element is involved.⁹

1. Changing a Behavioral Cognitive Element. When a person learns that something he is doing is dissonant with some environmental element, the dissonance can be removed by changing the behavior cognitive element in such a way that it is consonant with the environmental demand. If a person who is a racial segregationist learns that he will not be allowed to operate his business on a segregated basis and it is a goal of his to continue operating the business, then he can make his behavior comply with the law. If a person drinks and later thinks that it is bad for his health, he may stop drinking. On the other hand, he may not. The difficulty of changing may be too great. The eliminating of one dissonance may produce a whole set of new ones.

2. Changing an Environmental Cognitive Element. This procedure is essentially the reverse of number one. Just as it is possible to change a behavioral element of a person, it is often possible to change the environmental cognitive element. This seems particularly appropriate in respect to the social environment. If one's neighborhood environment is dissonant with one's behavioral or cognitive tastes, then one can seek out a more consonant neighborhood. If one has a particular belief about some particular person, this belief can be changed by one's learning that others whom he respects hold views toward this person that contradict his. Likewise, one's views toward this person can change because other's views of him have changed.

3. Adding New Cognitive Elements. Suppose it is not possible to change either the behavioral cognitive element or the environmental element. If it is impossible to eliminate the dissonance

⁸Ibid., p. 3.

⁹Ibid., pp. 19-24.

by changing one of the elements involved, then it may be possible to reduce it by adding a new cognitive element.

Probably the most significant implication of dissonance theory in relation to attitude change is that dissonance is at a maximum when two opposing cognitive elements are equally important in value and involve equal perceived instrumentality. In this case, attitude change would be negligible; but, if the value of one of the cognitive elements can be altered, then great change may occur. However, it should be noted that one who is forced to make a decision on the side of greater pressure might change his behavior but experience no significant attitude change.¹⁰ It is this possibility which would make even further research on the topic at hand more interesting.

WHICH ATTITUDES ARE CHANGED?

Not all attitudes are equally susceptible to change agents, those we have discussed or others. Those held by an audience that possesses a high degree of sophistication on the subject under consideration will be difficult to change, while those held by a naive audience will be more easily altered. Thus, American students who read a story about a foreign head of state will be more easily influenced than if they read one on President Nixon--assuming, of course, that they know little of the foreigner, and have bothered to learn of Nixon.

¹⁰While forced behavior change does not necessarily mean that attitude change will result, much research (the works by Stouffer and others listed in the Selected Bibliography) has shown that it usually does.

Another dimension in the study of attitude change concerns the salience an attitude holds for the individual. It is not difficult to change the opinions one holds about trivial or peripheral matters; however, it is something else to move a person concerning something which is central to his life. Thus Rokeach has concluded that it is easier to change the opinions of "middle-of-the roaders" than of those who are considered extreme or fanatical.¹¹

Finally, those attitudes which are easily changed are those which concern objects relatively new to us, and which are not especially salient or pleasant. However, as we noted from Rosenberg, attitudes grounded in cognitive structures are more resistant. Those which are of vital concern will have caused us to build up an elaborate defense system for their protection.

¹¹Rokeach, The Open and Closed Mind (New York: Basic Books, 1960).

CHAPTER VIII

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

SUMMARY

The purpose of my study, as stated in the introduction, was to better understand the differing attitudes of the leadership of the Seventh-day Adventist Church toward inner-city work. In this final chapter, I will attempt to summarize the information I have gathered before drawing any conclusions, organizing the material according to the 11 questions given there.

1. What do Seventh-day Adventist leaders think about the urban projects that the church has carried on? In general, do they approve or disapprove? Answers to question 4 showed overwhelmingly that most S.D.A. leaders were in favor of one specific project that had been carried on. When asked more generally, in question 17, they showed again that they were for inner-city projects and that those already undertaken met their approval, although not without qualifications. Those qualifications were most often a concern for "balance." One qualifying statement which summarizes most of this type of answer, was: "Good judgment needs to be exercised." This, of course, is good advice for any situation.

2. Do they feel that Ellen White would approve or disapprove if she were alive today? One hundred and eighteen of the 135 respondents to question 5 agreed that Ellen White's writings give the

idea that we should be involved in inner-city work. Question 11 was more directly related, and also showed responses heavily in favor of inner-city work. Almost all the respondents felt Ellen White would either approve of present inner-city work or urge intensification and expansion.

3. How much do they know about inner-city programs? All but 2 respondents knew at least something about the inner-city projects of the church.

4. If they are acquainted with such programs, where did they get their information? Do they consider the source reliable? Although a good number of the respondents received their information from each of the alternatives listed--direct involvement, hearsay, children, and publications--other methods were also noted. Many had been members of committees which had discussed inner-city work; however, I had completely failed to take this possibility into consideration when designing the questionnaire. Almost all of the respondents felt their source- were reliable.

5. Were their ages, positions, or other personal characteristics related to any significant degree to their feelings toward such programs? There were many significant associations between personal characteristics and attitudes which were expressed in answer to certain of the questions.

I expected that the younger a respondent was, the more liberal-minded he would be concerning race relations. Such proved to be the case, except that those 29 years of age or under, who are leaders in the church, are less likely to be willing to admit members of other

races or ethnic groups to the closest of the categories given, "to close kinship by marriage," than would be expected statistically.

One of the most interesting findings of the study was that almost 11 per cent of the Caucasian respondents said they would marry those of Negro descent. This factor was very interesting, especially in light of the fact that Negroes were consistently placed at the very bottom of the Bogardus Social Distance Scale.

Other interesting aspects of the comparisons between the social distance scale and personal characteristics were that those with seminary training tended to be more open to the inclusion of ethnic groups to close association; and one local conference--Potomac--which was not a Negro organization, actually had more leaders who would admit Negroes "to close kinship by marriage" than would be expected statistically.

More liberal attitudes toward inner-city work seem to prevail where the population has a high proportion of members of certain minority groups, where the residence of the respondent is close to where an inner-city project has been carried on, and with those who are more open to close association with members of the ethnic groups listed on the Bogardus Scale. Also, those who favor some aspects of inner-city work also tend to approve of other aspects.

A few cross-tabulations were run between certain personal characteristics; only one is directly relevant to this study. It showed that Negroes in the Seventh-day Adventist denomination are more likely to hold positions at the local pastor level--and not in the General Conference--than are those leaders who are Caucasian.

6. Do they feel more Seventh-day Adventist ministers should be involved in inner-city projects? If so, in what capacity? Only one respondent felt that ministers should not be involved in inner-city work at all; however, approximately 30 per cent qualified their positive answers, stating often that the involvement must be carefully considered as to type and extent. How the minister should be involved was a difficult question for the leaders. Most gave the pastor the freedom to choose how he should be involved, but many thought he should be the leader no matter what type of project was under consideration.

7. Should more denominational schools be involved? Which ones? To what degree? Only 3 of the leaders felt the schools should not participate in inner-city projects, and almost all thought either many levels or all of the schools should be involved. It seemed very clear that the denomination's leaders are generally for the type of work that has been carried on so far, since most of it had been done by the church's educational institutions.

8. How would the attitudes of church leaders relate to their scores on a test that measures prejudice? This is discussed under question 5.

9. Would the leaders themselves be willing to become involved in inner-city projects? This is a question in which I was very interested. It is easy to say that others--e.g. the schools--should work in such projects, but the true test is whether or not the respondent himself would be willing to become involved. All but 3 stated that they would become involved in one capacity or another, although most

were cautious because of lack of time or skills. In another question, a full 70 of the respondents said they would be willing to spend several hours per week on such a project.

10. Do the leaders feel that inner-city work is necessary to the mission of the Seventh-day Adventist Church? And since the last word of the denominational name denotes an expectancy of the imminent return of Christ, must inner-city work be done before that event can take place? These questions were, of course, crucial to the whole study. The mission of the church and the return of Christ are and should be two of the most important aspects for consideration by anyone who claims to be a minister or leader in the S.D.A. Church. The highest percentage of respondents on any question cast their votes together on this issue. One hundred and twenty-three of the 135 said inner-city work is necessary to the mission of the church. This, of course, does not show what the individual respondent feels the mission of the church is, but it does show that no matter what it is in his opinion, inner-city work is crucial to its completion. A later question, although structured poorly, also showed that the leaders feel that inner-city work is important and that it must be done, whether or not it is the S.D.A. Church that does it.

11. Finally, Saturday is a sacred day to Seventh-day Adventists. How do the leaders feel about work in the city being done on the "Sabbath?" This question, as I expected, provoked the strongest responses of any. Less than half of the respondents said they approved of Sabbath inner-city work without qualification. Of those who wrote in their qualifications, almost all were concerned with the type of

activity done on the Sabbath, not with such work, per se.

CONCLUDING STATEMENTS

The research has shown that Seventh-day Adventist leaders are in favor of inner-city work in the church today, but that they are concerned about the type and extent of the activity engaged in and the day on which it is carried on. It is also evident that those attitudes which were negative toward such work can be changed; whether or not they should is a question beyond the scope of this paper.

IMPLICATIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

Almost any research in the social sciences raises more questions than it answers; consequently, I wish to present some aspects of this subject which might warrant further study.

1. The research project could have produced more clear-cut replies if the term "inner-city" had been defined at the beginning. Apparently, most people would say the term is synonymous with "ghetto." This, of course, is certainly not the case. A better definition would include all those who inhabit the densely populated core of the city: the very wealthy, the unmarried, business executives, and the elderly, as well as the destitute and the ghetto resident. However, respondents naturally answered according to their own definition.

2. If restrictions of time, money, and the scope of a D. Min. paper were not considerations, I would have widened the scope of both the sample and the study into the backgrounds of existing attitude patterns. Since the Seventh-day Adventist Church's educational

institutions have been the main focus of inner-city interest and work, certainly some administrators and faculty of those institutions should be included in the sample. Even though they may not be directly involved in certain of the church's decision-making processes, they certainly are prime factors in the shaping of denominational attitudes. Also, the editors of the leading church publications should be included in any further study of attitudes. They, of course, play an important role in attitude formation. A more thorough understanding of the backgrounds of the existing attitudes uncovered could also be very interesting and enlightening to such a research project.

3. Finally, although a definition of the "mission of the church," per se, was not of particular significance at the outset of this study, it has become so by the time of writing. At present, certain committees are giving study to this question in an effort to determine just what the "mission" is and what it includes. In light of this interest, it would have been valuable to attempt to determine what each respondent's concept of the mission of the church is, and to relate such a conceptual response to his attitudes toward inner-city work. Hopefully, this most interesting aspect can be studied in the future.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Adorno, T. W., et. al. The Authoritarian Personality. New York: Harper Brothers, 1950.
- Allport, G. W. The Nature of Prejudice. Boston: Beacon Press, 1954.
- Bettelheim, Bruno, and Janowitz, Morris. Social Change and Prejudice. New York: Free Press, 1964.
- Bogardus, E. S. "Measuring Social Distance," Journal of Applied Sociology, IX (1925), 299-308.
- Boney, Robert. The Origin of the Seventh-day Adventist Inner-city Mission Work in and Around San Francisco. Unpublished paper in the E. G. White Vault, Andrews University, May, 1969.
- Brown, Roger. Social Psychology. New York: Free Press, 1965.
- Butler, Jonathan. "Ellen G. White and the Chicago Mission," Spectrum, II:1 (Winter 1970), 41-51.
- Carlson, E. R. "Attitude Change through Modification of Attitude Structure." Journal of Abnormal Social Psychology, LII (1955), 254-261.
- Chamberlain, Theadore J. "Our Mission to the Cities," Insight, II (August 10, 1971), 19-20.
- Child, I. "Socialization," in Gardner Lindzey (ed.) The Handbook of Social Psychology. Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley, III: 450-589, 1969.
- Culbertson, F. M. "Modification of an Emotionally-held Attitude through Role Playing." Journal of Abnormal Social Psychology, LIV (1957), 230-233.
- Doby, John T. Introduction to Social Psychology. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1966.
- Festinger, L. A Theory of Cognitive Dissonance. Evanston: Row, Peterson, 1957.
- Festinger, L., et. al. Conflict, Decision, and Dissonance. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1964.
- Ford, L. I. "The Relationship Between Prejudice and Dogmatism in Opinion Change." Dissertation Abstracts, XVI (1956), 2522.
- Greenberg, H., et. al. "The Effects of Single-session Education Techniques on Prejudice Attitudes," Journal of Educational Sociology, XXXI (1957), 82-86.

- Guttman, L. "The Basis for Scalogram Analysis," in S. A. Stouffer, et. al. Measurement and Prediction. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1950.
- Haskell, S. N. "Our City Missions," Review and Herald, LXI:18 (April 29, 1884), 278.
- Hollander, Edwin P. Principles and Methods of Social Psychology. New York: Oxford University Press, 1967.
- Katz, D. "The Functional Approach to the Study of Attitudes," Public Opinion Quarterly, XXIV (1960), 163-204.
- Katz, D., et. al. "Ego-defense and Attitude Change." Human Relations, IX (1933), 27-45.
- Knower, F. "Experimental Studies of Changes in Attitudes, I." Journal of Social Psychology, VI (1935), 315-347.
- _____. "Experimental Studies of Changes in Attitudes, II." Journal of Social Psychology, XXX (1936), 522-532.
- Likert, R. "A Technique for the Measurement of Attitudes," Archives of Psychology, No. 4 (1932).
- Lindgren, Henry Clay. An Introduction to Social Psychology. New York: Wiley, 1969.
- MacKenzie, Barbara K. "The Importance of Contact in Determining Attitudes Toward Negroes." Journal of Abnormal Psychology, XLIII (1948), 417-441.
- McGuire, William J. "The Nature of Attitudes and Attitude Change," in The Handbook of Social Psychology. 2nd ed. Edited by Gardner Lindzey and Elliot Aronson. Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley, III:136-314, (1969).
- Remmers, H. H. and C. L. Morgan. "Changing Attitudes Toward a Racial Group." Purdue University Studies in Higher Education, XXXI, 109-114.
- "Editorial." Review and Herald, CXLV:49 (December 5, 1968), 2-5.
- Rice, T. Richard. "Adventists and Welfare Work: A Comparative Study," Spectrum, II:1 (Winter 1970), 52-63.
- Rokeach, M. "The Nature of Attitudes," The International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences. Edited by David L. Sills. I (1968), 449-457.

- _____. The Open and Closed Mind. New York: Basic Books, 1960.
- Rosenberg, M. J. "An Analysis of Affective-Cognitive Consistency," in his Attitude Organization and Change. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1960.
- _____. "A Structural Theory of Attitude Dynamics," Public Opinion Quarterly, XXIV (1960), 319-340.
- _____. "Cognitive Reorganization in Response to the Hypnotic Reversal of Attitudinal Affect," Journal of Personality, XXVIII (1960), 39-63.
- _____. "Cognitive Structure and Attitudinal Affect," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, LIII (1956), 367-372.
- Schwartz, Richard W. "John Harvey Kellogg: Adventism's Social Gospel Advocate," Spectrum, I:2 (Spring 1969), 15-28.
- Scott, William A. "Attitude Measurement," in The Handbook of Social Psychology. 2nd ed. Edited by Gardner Lindzey and Elliot Aronson. Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley, II: 204-273, 1968.
- Secord, Paul F., and Carl W. Backman. Social Psychology. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1964.
- Seventh-day Adventist Yearbook: 1885. Battle Creek: Seventh-day Adventist Publishing Association, 1885.
- Seventh-day Adventist Yearbook: 1970. Washington: Review and Herald, 1970.
- Signs of the Times: Earthquake Special, Mountain View, Calif.: Pacific Press, XXXII:18 (May 2, 1906).
- Stouffer, Samuel A., et. al. The American Soldier. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1949.
- The Life Boat, Chicago, Illinois, XII:9 (September, 1909).
- Thurston, E. L., and E. J. Chave. The Measurement of Attitudes. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1929.
- Watson, Goodwin. Social Psychology: Issues and Insights. Philadelphia: Lippincott, 1966.
- White, Ellen G. Acts of the Apostles. Mountain View, Calif.: Pacific Press, 1911.
- _____. Child Guidance. Nashville: Southern Pub. Assn., 1954.

- _____. Christian Service. Washington: Review and Herald, 1947.
- _____. Christ's Object Lessons. Washington: Review and Herald, 1941.
- _____. Counsels on Diet and Foods. Washington: Review and Herald, 1938.
- _____. Counsels on Health. Mountain View, Calif.: Pacific Press, 1951.
- _____. Counsels to Parents, Teachers, and Students. Mountain View, Calif.: Pacific Press, 1943.
- _____. Education. Mountain View, Calif.: Pacific Press, 1952.
- _____. Evangelism. Washington: Review and Herald, 1946.
- _____. Gospel Workers. Washington: Review and Herald, 1915.
- _____. Medical Ministry. Mountain View, Calif.: Pacific Press, 1932.
- _____. Selected Messages from the Writings of Ellen G. White. Washington: Review and Herald, 1958.
- _____. Testimonies for the Church. Mountain View, Calif.: Pacific Press, 1948.
- _____. Testimonies to Ministers and Gospel Workers. Mountain View, Calif.: Pacific Press, 1962.
- _____. The Desire of Ages. Mountain View, Calif.: Pacific Press, 1940.
- _____. The Great Controversy. Mountain View, Calif.: Pacific Press, 1950.
- _____. The Ministry of Healing. Mountain View, Calif.: Pacific Press, 1942.
- _____. Welfare Ministry. Washington: Review and Herald, 1952.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX I

LETTER OF INTRODUCTION AND QUESTIONNAIRE

LOMA LINDA UNIVERSITY
Department of Sociology and Anthropology
The Graduate School
Loma Linda, California 92354

April 24, 1970

Dear Denominational Leader:

You have been chosen as part of a random sample of leaders of the Seventh-day Adventist Church in the United States. We are interested in how you, as a leader of our church, feel about certain inner-city projects of the denomination.

Would you please take a few minutes right now to complete the enclosed questionnaire? You need not give your name and your answers will be kept completely anonymous. The purpose of the study is not to degrade or praise any person or group, but only to serve as a tool for better understanding of the church and its mission.

If you would like to receive a summary of the results, just enclose a self-addressed, stamped envelope when you return your questionnaire. We appreciate your help in this project.

Sincerely,



Theodore J. Chamberlain
Instructor in Sociology

Enclosure

Directions for Question 1: According to my first feeling reactions I would willingly admit members of each race or nationality (as a class and not the best I have known, nor the worst members) to one or more of the classifications which I have circled.

| 1. | To close kinship by marriage | To my club as personal chums | To my street as neighbors | To em- ployment in my occupation | To citi- zenship in my country | As visi- tors only to my country | Would exclude from my country |
|---------------|--|---------------------------------------|------------------------------------|---|---|---|--|
| English | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| Indians | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| Jews | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| Mexicans | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| Negroes | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| Oriental | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| Puerto Ricans | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| Russians | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| Swedes | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |

Directions for Questions 2 - 20: Please check one answer that comes closest to your feelings about the question. Feel free to make additional comments on any question, using the back of the page if necessary.

2. At the present date what would you say you know about present or past inner-city work that has been carried on under S.D.A. auspices?

- ☐ 1. a great deal
☐ 2. some about it
☐ 3. very little about it
☐ 4. nothing about it

3. Did you get your information

- ☐ 1. from direct involvement
☐ 2. from hearsay
☐ 3. from your children
☐ 4. from denominational publications
☐ 5. some combination of the above, please specify _____
☐ 6. other, please specify _____
☐ 7. know nothing about it

4. When you heard that the seminary was sending a group of ministerial students to work in the Washington, D. C. ghettos for the summer were you

- ☐ 1. in favor of the project
☐ 2. not much concerned
☐ 3. against the project
☐ 4. haven't heard about it
☐ 5. other, please specify _____
 comments _____

5. Do you feel that Ellen White's writings generally give the idea that

- ☐ 1. we should be involved in inner-city work of many kinds
☐ 2. we should only use preaching and medical evangelism in inner-city work
☐ 3. we should limit ourselves to preaching the gospel in the city
☐ 4. we should stay out of the cities
☐ 5. other, please specify _____
 comments _____

(next page)

6. Do you feel that the source from which you received your information on the present inner-city work was
- ☐ 1. reliable
 - ☐ 2. some reliable, some not reliable
 - ☐ 3. not reliable
 - ☐ 4. other, please specify _____
7. Is it your opinion that S.D.A. ministers should
- ☐ 1. be more involved in inner-city work
 - ☐ 2. continue at the level that they are involved at present in inner-city work
 - ☐ 3. not be involved in inner-city work
 - ☐ 4. other, please specify _____
comments _____
8. If you feel they should be involved in inner-city work, then how?
- ☐ 1. as leaders, but away from the actual front
 - ☐ 2. as fellow workers in the midst of it
 - ☐ 3. in any way they see fit
 - ☐ 4. other, please specify _____
comments _____
9. If asked to participate in inner-city work, would you
- ☐ 1. become intimately involved
 - ☐ 2. help, but only in certain areas
 - ☐ 3. be cautious about becoming involved
 - ☐ 4. reject the invitation
 - ☐ 5. other, please specify _____
comments _____
10. How far do you live from where the nearest Adventist inner-city project has been carried on?
- ☐ 1. within 10 miles
 - ☐ 2. within 25 miles
 - ☐ 3. within 50 miles
 - ☐ 4. within 100 miles
 - ☐ 5. more than 100 miles
 - ☐ 6. don't know of any
11. If Ellen White were alive today and could see the inner-city projects that have been carried on, do you feel she would
- ☐ 1. highly approve
 - ☐ 2. approve
 - ☐ 3. would not be much concerned
 - ☐ 4. disapprove
 - ☐ 5. other, please specify _____
comments _____
12. Do you feel our schools should be involved in inner-city work?
- ☐ 1. yes
 - ☐ 2. don't know
 - ☐ 3. no
 - ☐ 4. no opinion
 - ☐ 5. other, please specify _____
comments _____
13. Which schools should be involved?
- ☐ 1. only the ministerial students in our seminary
 - ☐ 2. only universities
 - ☐ 3. only colleges
 - ☐ 4. only academies
 - ☐ 5. only grade schools
 - ☐ 6. some combination of the above, please specify _____
 - ☐ 7. all of the above
 - ☐ 8. none of the above

(next page)

14. Is inner-city work necessary in the mission of the S.D.A. Church?

- ☐ 1. yes
☐ 2. not sure
☐ 3. no
 comments _____

15. If Christ were here, would He

- ☐ 1. help the poor in the inner-city in any possible way
☐ 2. attempt to heal them of physical disease only
☐ 3. preach to them while attempting to heal them physically and emotionally
☐ 4. preach to them and heal them, but not be involved with solving their social problems
☐ 5. be concerned for their many social problems, but feel that was work for someone else
☐ 6. say the poor will always be with us, so we should concern ourselves with more important work
☐ 7. other, please specify _____
 comments _____

16. Will Christ come whether we are involved in inner-city work or not?

- ☐ 1. yes
☐ 2. don't know
☐ 3. no
 comments _____

17. Do you feel the majority of the inner-city programs are

- ☐ 1. a waste of time
☐ 2. worthwhile only to those in the ghetto
☐ 3. good only for the workers involved
☐ 4. what our Saviour would want us to do
☐ 5. other, please specify _____
 comments _____

18. What distance do you live from the center of a city where minority groups are substantially represented?

- ☐ 1. live in such an area
☐ 2. live less than 10 miles from one
☐ 3. live 10-25 miles from one
☐ 4. live 25-50 miles from one
☐ 5. live 50-100 miles from one
☐ 6. live more than 100 miles from one

19. If an inner-city project were set up near you, would you

- ☐ 1. make your voice heard in opposition to the project
☐ 2. be indifferent
☐ 3. support the project verbally
☐ 4. become involved yourself, but very sparingly
☐ 5. be willing to spend several hours per week on the project
☐ 6. other, please specify _____
 comments _____

20. Some Adventists have been involved in inner-city work on the Sabbath. Do you

- ☐ 1. approve openly
☐ 2. approve, but prefer not to stir up others with your opinions
☐ 3. have no feelings either way
☐ 4. disapprove
 comments _____

(use back of page if necessary)

(next page)

21. The following data is needed for cross tabulation of replies. Please answer as best you can.

Age _____ Sex _____ Race _____ Years in Denominational Service _____

Marital Status: Single _____ Married _____ Other _____

Children: Yes _____ No _____ If yes, how many _____ What ages: _____

One or more of my children attend an S.D.A: Grade School _____, Academy _____, College _____, University _____, Seminary _____. Did you attend an S.D.A. educational institution _____. If so, at which level: Grade School _____, Academy _____, College _____, University _____, Seminary _____. What was your major in college _____, and in the university _____.

Have you ever attended any secular school of higher learning: Yes _____ No _____. If so, at what level: College _____, Master's Degree _____, Doctoral Degree _____, Other Degree _____. How long did you attend such an institution: Less than 1 year _____, 1 year _____ 1-3 years _____, 3+ years _____. During which of the following periods did you attend such a school: pre-1950 _____, 1950-60 _____, 1960-70 _____. In what local conference is your church membership _____. Under which of the following categories does your position fall: General Conference level _____, Union level _____, Local Conference level _____, Local Pastor _____, Other _____.

APPENDIX II

Table 4: Item Analysis Table of Responses to the Bogardus Social Distance Scale (Consult Appendix I, page 100) n=135

Note: Those numbers in parentheses are percentages.

| | To close kinship by marriage | To my club as personal chums | To my street as neighbors | To em- ployment in my occupation | To citi- zenship in my country | As visi- tors only to my country | Would exclude from my country | Non re- sponse |
|---------------|--|---------------------------------------|------------------------------------|---|---|---|--|----------------------|
| English | 117 (87) | 5 (4) | 2 (1) | 1 (1) | | | | 10 (7) |
| Indians | 49 (36) | 56 (41) | 9 (7) | 7 (5) | 1 (1) | | | 13 (10) |
| Jews | 79 (59) | 33 (24) | 8 (6) | 3 (2) | 1 (1) | 1 (1) | | 10 (7) |
| Mexicans | 45 (33) | 59 (44) | 9 (7) | 9 (7) | 1 (1) | | | 12 (9) |
| Negroes | 26 (19) | 75 (56) | 7 (5) | 15 (11) | 1 (1) | | | 11 (8) |
| Oriental | 38 (28) | 71 (53) | 12 (9) | 3 (2) | | | | 11 (8) |
| Puerto Ricans | 38 (28) | 62 (46) | 9 (7) | 11 (8) | 1 (1) | | 1 (1) | 13 (10) |
| Russians | 87 (64) | 24 (18) | 5 (4) | 3 (2) | | 3 (2) | 1 (1) | 12 (9) |
| Swedes | 108 (80) | 10 (7) | 2 (1) | 2 (1) | | | | 13 (10) |

APPENDIX III

Item Analysis of Responses to Questions 2-20

Note: Percentages below may not total to 100 due to the fact that those who wrote in comments without checking any item, and those who chose not to respond at all are not included.

2. At the present date what would you say you know about present or past inner-city work that has been carried on under S.D.A. auspices?

| | |
|-----------|-------------------------|
| <u>18</u> | 1. a great deal |
| <u>57</u> | 2. some about it |
| <u>24</u> | 3. very little about it |
| <u>1</u> | 4. nothing about it |

3. Did you get your information

| | |
|-----------|--|
| <u>21</u> | 1. from direct involvement |
| <u>12</u> | 2. from hearsay |
| <u>1</u> | 3. from your children |
| <u>16</u> | 4. from denominational publications |
| <u>36</u> | 5. some combination of the above, please specify |
| <u>13</u> | 6. other, please specify |
| <u>1</u> | 7. know nothing about it |

4. When you heard that the seminary was sending a group of ministerial students to work in the Washington, D.C. ghettos for the summer were you

| | |
|-----------|-----------------------------------|
| <u>72</u> | 1. in favor of the project |
| <u>5</u> | 2. not much concerned |
| <u>1</u> | 3. against the project |
| <u>18</u> | 4. haven't heard about it |
| <u>4</u> | 5. other, please specify comments |

5. Do you feel that Ellen White's writings generally give the idea that

| | |
|-----------|---|
| <u>87</u> | 1. we should be involved in inner-city work of many kinds |
| <u>5</u> | 2. we should only use preaching and medical evangelism in inner-city work |
| <u>1</u> | 3. we should limit ourselves to preaching the gospel in the city |
| <u>1</u> | 4. we should stay out of the cities |
| <u>4</u> | 5. other, please specify comments |

6. Do you feel that the source from which you received your information on the present inner-city work was

- 88 1. reliable
9 2. some reliable, some not reliable
0 3. not reliable
2 4. other, please specify

7. Is it your opinion that S.D.A. ministers should

- 70 1. be more involved in inner-city work
14 2. continue at the level that they are involved at present in inner-city work
1 3. not be involved in inner-city work
13 4. other, please specify
 comments

8. If you feel they should be involved in inner-city work, then how?

- 8 1. as leaders, but away from the actual front
41 2. as fellow workers in the midst of it
36 3. in any way they see fit
10 4. other, please specify
 comments

9. If asked to participate in inner-city work, would you

- 45 1. become intimately involved
33 2. help, but only in certain areas
4 3. be cautious about becoming involved
2 4. reject the invitation
12 5. other, please specify
 comments

10. How far do you live from where the nearest Adventist inner-city project has been carried on?

- 38 1. within 10 miles
28 2. within 25 miles
7 3. within 50 miles
9 4. within 100 miles
12 5. more than 100 miles
7 6. don't know of any

11. If Ellen White were alive today and could see the inner-city projects that have been carried on, do you feel she would

- 19 1. highly approve
53 2. approve
1 3. would not be much concerned
4 4. disapprove
16 5. other, please specify
 comments

12. Do you feel our schools should be involved in inner-city work?

- 80 1. yes
7 2. don't know
4 3. no
1 4. no opinion
6 5. other, please specify
 comments

13. Which schools should be involved?

- 1 1. only the ministerial students in our seminary
2 2. only universities
4 3. only colleges
0 4. only academies
0 5. only grade schools
59 6. some combination of the above, please specify
30 7. all of the above
1 8. none of the above

14. Is inner-city work necessary in the mission of the S.D.A. Church?

- 91 1. yes
5 2. not sure
2 3. no
 comments

15. If Christ were here, would He

- 62 1. help the poor in the inner-city in any possible way
0 2. attempt to heal them of physical disease only
24 3. preach to them while attempting to heal them physically and emotionally
4 4. preach to them and heal them, but not be involved with solving their social problems
0 5. be concerned for their many social problems, but feel that was work for someone else
0 6. say the poor will always be with us, so we should concern ourselves with more important work
7 7. other, please specify
 comments

16. Will Christ come whether we are involved in inner-city work or not?

- 67 1. yes
9 2. don't know
18 3. no
 comments

17. Do you feel the majority of the inner-city programs are

- 1 1. a waste of time
- 2 2. worthwhile only to those in the ghetto
- 1 3. good only for the workers involved
- 64 4. what our Saviour would want us to do
- 21 5. other, please specify
comments

18. What distance do you live from the center of a city where minority groups are substantially represented?

- 16 1. live in such an area
- 42 2. live less than 10 miles from one
- 24 3. live 10-25 miles from one
- 7 4. live 25-50 miles from one
- 4 5. live 50-100 miles from one
- 4 6. live more than 100 miles from one

19. If an inner-city project were set up near you, would you

- 0 1. make your voice heard in opposition to the project
- 1 2. be indifferent
- 13 3. support the project verbally
- 16 4. become involved yourself, but very sparingly
- 52 5. be willing to spend several hours per week on the project
- 16 6. other, please specify
comments

20. Some Adventists have been involved in inner-city work on the Sabbath. Do you

- 37 1. approve openly
- 7 2. approve, but prefer not to stir up others with your opinions
- 9 3. have no feelings either way
- 16 4. disapprove
comments

APPENDIX IV

Tables 5-25: Item Analysis Tables of Personal Characteristics

Note: Due to non-response and averaging, some totals may not equal exactly 135 or percentages exactly 100.

Table 5: Age

| Answer | Number | Percentage |
|--------------|--------|------------|
| 29 and under | 8 | 6 |
| 30-44 | 34 | 25 |
| 45-59 | 75 | 56 |
| 60 and over | 17 | 13 |
| TOTALS | 134 | 100 |

Table 6: Sex

| Answer | Number | Percentage |
|--------|--------|------------|
| Male | 132 | 98 |
| Female | 3 | 2 |
| TOTALS | 135 | 100 |

Table 7: Race

| Answer | Number | Percentage |
|-----------|--------|------------|
| Caucasian | 119 | 88 |
| Negro | 13 | 10 |
| Oriental | 1 | 1 |
| TOTALS | 133 | 99 |

Table 8: Years in Denominational Service

| Answer | Number | Percentage |
|--------|--------|------------|
| 0-9 | 20 | 15 |
| 10-19 | 25 | 19 |
| 20-29 | 52 | 39 |
| 30-39 | 31 | 23 |
| 40-49 | 6 | 4 |
| TOTALS | 134 | 100 |

Table 9: Marital Status

| Answer | Number | Percentage |
|---------|--------|------------|
| Single | 4 | 3 |
| Married | 131 | 97 |
| TOTALS | 135 | 100 |

Table 10: Number of Children

| Answer | Number | Percentage |
|--------|--------|------------|
| 0 | 14 | 10 |
| 1 | 20 | 15 |
| 2 | 40 | 30 |
| 3 | 38 | 28 |
| 4 | 18 | 13 |
| 5 | 3 | 2 |
| 6 | 2 | 1 |
| TOTALS | 135 | 99 |

Table 11: Age Group of Children

| Answer | Number | Percentage |
|------------------------|--------|------------|
| No Children | 14 | 10 |
| Under Academy Age | 32 | 24 |
| Academy or College Age | 64 | 47 |
| Over College Age | 25 | 19 |
| TOTALS | 135 | 100 |

Table 12: Attendance at an S.D.A. School

| Answer | Number | Percentage |
|--------|--------|------------|
| Yes | 127 | 94 |
| No | 6 | 4 |
| TOTALS | 133 | 98 |

Table 13: Attendance at an S.D.A. Grade School

| Answer | Number | Percentage |
|--------|--------|------------|
| Yes | 62 | 46 |
| No | 73 | 54 |
| TOTALS | 135 | 100 |

Table 14: Attendance at an S.D.A. Academy

| Answer | Number | Percentage |
|--------|--------|------------|
| Yes | 81 | 60 |
| No | 54 | 40 |
| TOTALS | 135 | 100 |

Table 15: Attendance at an S.D.A. College

| Answer | Number | Percentage |
|--------|--------|------------|
| Yes | 123 | 91 |
| No | 12 | 9 |
| TOTALS | 135 | 100 |

Table 16: Attendance at an S.D.A. University

| Answer | Number | Percentage |
|--------|--------|------------|
| Yes | 28 | 21 |
| No | 107 | 79 |
| TOTALS | 135 | 100 |

Table 17: Attendance at the S.D.A. Seminary

| Answer | Number | Percentage |
|--------|--------|------------|
| Yes | 47 | 35 |
| No | 88 | 65 |
| TOTALS | 135 | 100 |

Table 18: College Major

| Answer | Number | Percentage |
|-----------|--------|------------|
| Theology | 87 | 64 |
| Business | 12 | 9 |
| History | 10 | 7 |
| Education | 6 | 4 |
| Other | 10 | 8 |
| None | 10 | 7 |
| TOTALS | 135 | 99 |

Table 19: Graduate Major

| Answer | Number | Percentage |
|-----------|--------|------------|
| Theology | 42 | 31 |
| Education | 8 | 6 |
| History | 3 | 2 |
| Speech | 3 | 2 |
| Business | 1 | 1 |
| None | 78 | 58 |
| TOTALS | 135 | 100 |

Table 20: Attendance at a Non-S.D.A. School

| Answer | Number | Percentage |
|--------|--------|------------|
| Yes | 58 | 43 |
| No | 71 | 53 |
| TOTALS | 129 | 96 |

Table 21: Level of Non-S.D.A. Education

| Answer | Number | Percentage |
|--------------|--------|------------|
| None | 80 | 59 |
| College | 18 | 13 |
| Master's | 22 | 16 |
| Doctoral | 12 | 9 |
| Other Degree | 3 | 2 |
| TOTALS | 135 | 99 |

Table 22: Length of Non-S.D.A. Education

| Answer | Number | Percentage |
|--------------------|--------|------------|
| None | 78 | 58 |
| Less than One Year | 17 | 13 |
| One Year | 14 | 10 |
| One to Three Years | 18 | 13 |
| Three Plus Years | 8 | 6 |
| TOTALS | 135 | 100 |

Table 23: Date of Non-S.D.A. Education

| Answer | Number | Percentage |
|----------|--------|------------|
| None | 76 | 56 |
| Pre-1950 | 20 | 15 |
| 1950-60 | 20 | 15 |
| 1960-70 | 19 | 14 |
| TOTALS | 135 | 100 |

Table 24: Conference of Church Membership

| Answer | Number | Percentage |
|-------------------------|--------|------------|
| Allegheny East | 6 | 4 |
| Chesapeake | 6 | 4 |
| Potomac | 41 | 30 |
| Illinois | 9 | 7 |
| Indiana | 4 | 3 |
| Michigan | 21 | 16 |
| Southeastern California | 9 | 7 |
| Southern California | 24 | 18 |
| Lake Region | 6 | 4 |
| Other | 9 | 7 |
| TOTALS | 135 | 100 |

Table 25: Position of Employment

| Answer | Number | Percentage |
|--------------------|--------|------------|
| General Conference | 34 | 25 |
| Union Conference | 22 | 16 |
| Local Conference | 31 | 23 |
| Pastor | 41 | 30 |
| Other | 6 | 4 |
| TOTALS | 134 | 98 |

APPENDIX V

Tables 26-28: Relationships of Personal Characteristics and Responses to Questions: Selected Children Square Tables

Note: The following tables (Appendices V-IX) include observed and expected frequencies (in parentheses). The chi-square is significant at the .05 level unless an asterisk is placed next to the table number, in which case the table was included to show significant trends noted in the body of the paper. The chief importance of the tables, however, is not in statistical significance, but rather in the kind and direction of relationship they show.

Table 26: Number of Children vs. Question 2 (knowledge of present or past inner-city work)

| | Great Deal | Some | Little | Nothing | TOTALS |
|------------|------------|---------|---------|---------|--------|
| 0 Children | 2 (2) | 9 (8) | 3 (3) | 0 (0) | 14 |
| 1 Child | 4 (4) | 7 (11) | 8 (5) | 1 (0) | 20 |
| 2 Children | 4 (7) | 30 (23) | 6 (9) | 0 (1) | 40 |
| 3 Children | 9 (7) | 19 (22) | 10 (9) | 0 (1) | 38 |
| 4 Children | 3 (3) | 11 (10) | 4 (4) | 0 (0) | 18 |
| 5 Children | 1 (1) | 0 (2) | 1 (1) | 1 (0) | 3 |
| 6 Children | 1 (0) | 1 (1) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 2 |
| TOTALS | 24 | 77 | 32 | 2 | 135 |

Table 27: Number of Children vs. Question 3 (where information was received)

| | Involvement | Hearsay | Children | Publications | Combination | Other | Know Nothing | TOTALS |
|------------|-------------|---------|----------|--------------|-------------|--------|--------------|--------|
| 0 Children | 3 (3) | 1 (2) | 0 (0) | 4 (2) | 0 (5) | 6 (2) | 0 (0) | 14 |
| 1 Child | 6 (4) | 4 (2) | 0 (0) | 2 (3) | 6 (7) | 1 (3) | 1 (0) | 20 |
| 2 Children | 7 (9) | 5 (5) | 1 (0) | 7 (6) | 14 (15) | 6 (5) | 0 (1) | 40 |
| 3 Children | 9 (8) | 2 (5) | 0 (0) | 6 (6) | 18 (14) | 3 (5) | 0 (1) | 38 |
| 4 Children | 3 (4) | 4 (2) | 0 (0) | 2 (3) | 8 (7) | 1 (2) | 0 (0) | 18 |
| 5 Children | 0 (1) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 2 (1) | 0 (0) | 1 (0) | 3 |
| 6 Children | 1 (0) | 0 (0) | 9 (0) | 0 (0) | 1 (1) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 2 |
| TOTALS | 29 | 16 | 1 | 21 | 49 | 17 | 2 | 135 |

Table 28*: Number of Children vs. Question 4 (response to the seminary sending ministerial students to work in Washington, D.C.)

| | In Favor | No Concern | Against | Haven't Heard | Other | TOTALS |
|------------|----------|------------|---------|---------------|--------|--------|
| 0 Children | 8 (10) | 1 (1) | 0 (0) | 5 (2) | 0 (1) | 14 |
| 1 Child | 13 (14) | 2 (1) | 0 (0) | 4 (4) | 1 (1) | 20 |
| 2 Children | 31 (29) | 2 (2) | 1 (0) | 6 (7) | 0 (2) | 40 |
| 3 Children | 28 (27) | 1 (2) | 0 (0) | 5 (7) | 4 (2) | 38 |
| 4 Children | 13 (13) | 1 (1) | 0 (0) | 3 (3) | 1 (1) | 18 |
| 5 Children | 2 (2) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 1 (1) | 0 (0) | 3 |
| 6 Children | 2 (1) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 2 |
| TOTALS | 97 | 7 | 1 | 24 | 6 | 135 |

APPENDIX VI

Tables 29-41: Relationships of Personal Characteristics and the Bogardus Social Distance Scale: Selected Chi-Square Tables (see Note in Appendix V, page 119)
 Note: Only the first five categories in the Bogardus Scale were checked for Negroes (see Appendix 11, page 105), so only those categories are used here for chi-square analysis. Also see the Note on page 31.

Table 29: The Bogardus Scale vs. Age

| | Non-Response | 29 and Under | 30-44 | 45-59 | 60 and Over | TOTALS |
|--------------|--------------|--------------|---------|---------|-------------|--------|
| Non-Response | 0 (0) | 1 (1) | 3 (3) | 6 (6) | 1 (1) | 11 |
| Marriage | 0 (0) | 1 (2) | 10 (7) | 14 (14) | 1 (3) | 26 |
| Chums | 0 (1) | 6 (4) | 17 (19) | 43 (42) | 9 (9) | 75 |
| Neighbors | 1 (1) | 0 (0) | 0 (2) | 5 (4) | 1 (1) | 7 |
| Occupation | 0 (0) | 0 (1) | 4 (4) | 7 (8) | 4 (2) | 15 |
| Citizenship | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (1) | 1 (0) | 1 |
| TOTALS | 1 | 8 | 34 | 75 | 17 | 135 |

Table 30: The Bogardus Scale vs. Race

| | Non-Response | Caucasian | Negro | Oriental | TOTALS |
|--------------|--------------|-----------|---------|----------|--------|
| Non-Response | 0 (0) | 10 (10) | 0 (1) | 1 (0) | 11 |
| Marriage | 0 (0) | 13 (23) | 13 (3) | 0 (0) | 26 |
| Chums | 2 (1) | 73 (66) | 0 (7) | 0 (1) | 75 |
| Neighbors | 0 (0) | 7 (6) | 0 (1) | 0 (0) | 7 |
| Occupation | 0 (0) | 15 (13) | 0 (1) | 0 (0) | 15 |
| Citizenship | 0 (0) | 1 (1) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 1 |
| TOTALS | 2 | 119 | 13 | 1 | 135 |

Table 31: The Bogardus Scale vs. Years of Denominational Service

| | Non-Response | 0-9 | 10-19 | 20-29 | 30-39 | 40-49 | TOTALS |
|--------------|--------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|--------|--------|
| Non-Response | 0 (0) | 2 (2) | 3 (2) | 3 (4) | 3 (3) | 0 (0) | 11 |
| Marriage | 0 (0) | 7 (4) | 5 (5) | 11 (10) | 2 (6) | 1 (1) | 26 |
| Chums | 0 (1) | 10 (11) | 11 (14) | 32 (29) | 20 (17) | 2 (3) | 75 |
| Neighbors | 1 (0) | 0 (1) | 1 (1) | 2 (3) | 2 (2) | 1 (0) | 7 |
| Occupation | 0 (0) | 1 (2) | 5 (3) | 4 (6) | 3 (3) | 2 (1) | 15 |
| Citizenship | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 1 (0) | 0 (0) | 1 |
| TOTALS | 1 | 20 | 25 | 52 | 31 | 6 | 135 |

Table 32*: The Bogardus Scale vs. Age Group of Children

| | No Children | Under Academy Age | Academy or College Age | Over College Age | TOTALS |
|--------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------------|---------------------|--------|
| Non-Response | 0 (1) | 4 (3) | 4 (5) | 3 (2) | 11 |
| Marriage | 2 (3) | 8 (6) | 14 (12) | 2 (5) | 26 |
| Chums | 8 (8) | 15 (18) | 38 (36) | 14 (14) | 75 |
| Neighbors | 2 (1) | 1 (2) | 3 (3) | 1 (1) | 7 |
| Occupation | 2 (2) | 4 (4) | 5 (7) | 4 (3) | 15 |
| Citizenship | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 1 (0) | 1 |
| TOTALS | 14 | 32 | 64 | 25 | 135 |

Table 33*: The Bogardus Scale vs. Attendance at the S.D.A. Seminary

| | Non-Attendance | Attendance | TOTALS |
|--------------|----------------|------------|--------|
| Non-Response | 8 (7) | 3 (4) | 11 |
| Marriage | 18 (17) | 8 (9) | 26 |
| Chums | 44 (49) | 31 (26) | 75 |
| Neighbors | 4 (5) | 3 (2) | 7 |
| Occupation | 13 (10) | 2 (5) | 15 |
| Citizenship | 1 (1) | 0 (0) | 1 |
| TOTALS | 88 | 47 | 135 |

Table 34*: The Bogardus Scale vs. College Major

| | Theology | Business | History | Education | Other | None | TOTALS |
|--------------|----------|----------|---------|-----------|--------|--------|--------|
| Non-Response | 5 (7) | 1 (1) | 2 (1) | 0 (0) | 0 (1) | 3 (1) | 11 |
| Marriage | 20 (17) | 1 (2) | 2 (2) | 0 (1) | 0 (2) | 3 (2) | 26 |
| Chums | 50 (48) | 6 (7) | 5 (6) | 4 (3) | 8 (6) | 2 (6) | 75 |
| Neighbors | 3 (5) | 1 (1) | 0 (1) | 1 (0) | 1 (1) | 1 (1) | 7 |
| Occupation | 9 (10) | 3 (1) | 1 (1) | 1 (0) | 1 (1) | 1 (1) | 15 |
| Citizenship | 1 (1) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 1 |
| TOTALS | 87 | 12 | 10 | 6 | 10 | 10 | 135 |

Table 35*: The Bogardus Scale vs. University Major

| | Theology | Education | History | Speech | Business | None | TOTALS |
|--------------|-----------|-----------|---------|---------|----------|-----------|--------|
| Non-Response | 3 (3) | 0 (1) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 8 (6) | 11 |
| Marriage | 9 (8) | 1 (2) | 0 (1) | 0 (1) | 0 (0) | 16 (15) | 26 |
| Chums | 25 (23) | 4 (4) | 2 (2) | 3 (2) | 1 (1) | 40 (43) | 75 |
| Neighbors | 3 (2) | 2 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 2 (4) | 7 |
| Occupation | 2 (5) | 1 (1) | 1 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 11 (9) | 15 |
| Citizenship | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 1 (1) | 1 |
| TOTALS | 42 | 8 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 78 | 135 |

Table 36: The Bogardus Scale vs. Attendance at a Non-S.D.A. School

| | Non-Response | Attendance | Non-Attendance | TOTALS |
|--------------|--------------|------------|----------------|--------|
| Non-Response | 4 (0) | 0 (5) | 7 (6) | 11 |
| Marriage | 1 (1) | 11 (11) | 14 (14) | 26 |
| Chums | 1 (3) | 36 (32) | 38 (39) | 75 |
| Neighbors | 0 (0) | 3 (3) | 4 (4) | 7 |
| Occupation | 0 (1) | 7 (6) | 8 (8) | 15 |
| Citizenship | 0 (0) | 1 (1) | 0 (1) | 1 |
| TOTALS | 6 | 58 | 71 | 135 |

Table 37*: The Bogardus Scale vs. Level of Non-S.D.A. Education

| | None | College | Master's | Doctoral | Other Degree | TOTALS |
|--------------|---------|---------|----------|----------|--------------|--------|
| Non-Response | 11 (7) | 0 (1) | 0 (2) | 0 (1) | 0 (0) | 11 |
| Marriage | 16 (15) | 4 (3) | 4 (4) | 1 (2) | 1 (1) | 26 |
| Chums | 41 (44) | 8 (10) | 15 (12) | 9 (7) | 2 (2) | 75 |
| Neighbors | 4 (4) | 0 (1) | 2 (1) | 1 (1) | 0 (0) | 7 |
| Occupation | 8 (9) | 5 (2) | 1 (2) | 1 (1) | 0 (0) | 15 |
| Citizenship | 0 (1) | 1 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 1 |
| TOTALS | 80 | 18 | 22 | 12 | 3 | 135 |

Table 38*: The Bogardus Scale vs. Length of Non-S.D.A. Education

| | None | Less Than 1 Year | 1 Year | 1-3 Years | 3+ Years | TOTALS |
|--------------|---------|------------------|--------|-----------|----------|--------|
| Non-Response | 11 (6) | 0 (1) | 0 (1) | 0 (1) | 0 (1) | 11 |
| Marriage | 16 (15) | 4 (3) | 1 (3) | 5 (3) | 0 (2) | 26 |
| Chums | 39 (43) | 11 (9) | 9 (8) | 10 (10) | 6 (4) | 75 |
| Neighbors | 4 (4) | 0 (1) | 1 (1) | 1 (1) | 1 (0) | 7 |
| Occupation | 8 (9) | 2 (2) | 2 (2) | 2 (2) | 1 (1) | 15 |
| Citizenship | 0 (1) | 0 (0) | 1 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 1 |
| TOTALS | 78 | 17 | 14 | 18 | 8 | 135 |

Table 39*: The Bogardus Scale vs. Date of Non-S.D.A. Education

| | None | Pre-1950 | 1950-60 | 1960-70 | TOTALS |
|--------------|---------|----------|---------|---------|--------|
| Non-Response | 10 (6) | 1 (2) | 0 (2) | 0 (2) | 11 |
| Marriage | 15 (15) | 4 (4) | 3 (4) | 4 (4) | 26 |
| Chums | 39 (42) | 7 (11) | 16 (11) | 3 (11) | 75 |
| Neighbors | 4 (4) | 2 (1) | 0 (1) | 1 (1) | 7 |
| Occupation | 8 (8) | 5 (2) | 1 (2) | 1 (2) | 15 |
| Citizenship | 0 (1) | 1 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 1 |
| TOTALS | 76 | 20 | 20 | 19 | 135 |

Table 40: The Bogardus Scale vs. Conference of Church Membership

| | Other | Allegheny East | Chesapeake | Potomac | Illinois | Indiana |
|--------------|--------|----------------|------------|---------|----------|---------|
| Non-Response | 1 (1) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 4 (3) | 1 (1) | 1 (0) |
| Marriage | 1 (2) | 6 (1) | 0 (1) | 8 (8) | 1 (2) | 0 (1) |
| Chums | 5 (5) | 0 (3) | 6 (3) | 22 (23) | 4 (5) | 3 (2) |
| Neighbors | 2 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 4 (2) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) |
| Occupation | 0 (1) | 0 (1) | 0 (1) | 3 (5) | 3 (1) | 0 (0) |
| Citizenship | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) |
| TOTALS | 9 | 6 | 6 | 41 | 9 | 4 |

Table 40: (continued)

| | Michigan | Southeastern California | Southern California | Lake Region | TOTALS |
|--------------|----------|----------------------------|------------------------|-------------|--------|
| Non-Response | 1 (2) | 0 (1) | 3 (2) | 0 (0) | 11 |
| Marriage | 1 (4) | 0 (2) | 3 (5) | 6 (1) | 26 |
| Chums | 12 (12) | 9 (5) | 14 (13) | 0 (3) | 75 |
| Neighbors | 1 (1) | 0 (0) | 0 (1) | 0 (0) | 7 |
| Occupation | 5 (2) | 0 (1) | 4 (3) | 0 (1) | 15 |
| Citizenship | 1 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 1 |
| TOTALS | 21 | 9 | 24 | 6 | 135 |

Table 41: The Bogardus Scale vs. Position of Employment

| | None | General Conference | Union Conference | Local Conference | Pastor | Other | TOTALS |
|--------------|--------|-----------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------|--------|--------|
| Non-Response | 0 (0) | 1 (3) | 2 (2) | 1 (3) | 6 (3) | 1 (0) | 11 |
| Marriage | 0 (0) | 7 (7) | 2 (4) | 5 (6) | 9 (8) | 3 (1) | 26 |
| Chums | 0 (1) | 20 (19) | 13 (12) | 21 (17) | 19 (23) | 2 (3) | 75 |
| Neighbors | 1 (0) | 5 (2) | 0 (1) | 0 (2) | 1 (2) | 0 (0) | 7 |
| Occupation | 0 (0) | 1 (4) | 5 (2) | 3 (3) | 6 (5) | 0 (1) | 15 |
| Citizenship | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 1 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 1 |
| TOTALS | 1 | 34 | 22 | 31 | 41 | 6 | 135 |

APPENDIX VII

Tables 42-47: Relationships of Responses to Questions and the Bogardus Social Distance Scale:
Selected Chi-Square Tables (see Note in Appendix V, page 119)

Table 42*: The Bogardus Scale vs. Question 7 (how involved S.D.A. ministers should be in inner-city work)

| | Non-Response | More | Same Level | None | Other | Comments | TOTALS |
|--------------|--------------|---------|------------|--------|---------|----------|--------|
| Non-Response | 0 (0) | 9 (8) | 1 (2) | 0 (0) | 0 (1) | 1 (0) | 11 |
| Marriage | 0 (0) | 22 (18) | 2 (4) | 0 (0) | 1 (3) | 1 (1) | 26 |
| Chums | 0 (1) | 48 (52) | 11 (11) | 1 (1) | 14 (9) | 1 (2) | 75 |
| Neighbors | 0 (0) | 6 (5) | 1 (1) | 0 (0) | 0 (1) | 0 (0) | 7 |
| Occupation | 1 (0) | 9 (10) | 3 (2) | 0 (0) | 2 (2) | 0 (0) | 15 |
| Citizenship | 0 (0) | 0 (1) | 1 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 1 |
| TOTALS | 1 | 94 | 19 | 1 | 17 | 3 | 135 |

Table 43: The Bogardus Scale vs. Question 9 (how involved respondents would become, if asked)

| | Non-Response | Intimately | Help | Cautious | Reject | Other | Comments | TOTALS |
|--------------|--------------|------------|----------|----------|---------|----------|----------|--------|
| Non-Response | 0 (0) | 4 (5) | 2 (4) | 1 (0) | 0 (0) | 3 (1) | 1 (0) | 11 |
| Marriage | 0 (0) | 19 (12) | 5 (9) | 0 (1) | 0 (1) | 1 (3) | 1 (0) | 26 |
| Chums | 1 (1) | 34 (34) | 23 (25) | 3 (3) | 3 (2) | 11 (9) | 0 (1) | 75 |
| Neighbors | 0 (0) | 2 (3) | 2 (2) | 2 (0) | 0 (0) | 1 (1) | 0 (0) | 7 |
| Occupation | 1 (0) | 2 (7) | 12 (5) | 0 (1) | 0 (0) | 0 (2) | 0 (0) | 15 |
| Citizenship | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 1 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 1 |
| TOTALS | 2 | 61 | 45 | 6 | 3 | 16 | 2 | 135 |

Table 44*: The Bogardus Scale vs. Question 10 (miles from nearest Adventist inner-city project)

| | Within 10 | Within 25 | Within 50 | Within 100 | 100+ | Don't Know | TOTALS |
|--------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|------------|--------|------------|--------|
| Non-Response | 5 (4) | 2 (3) | 0 (1) | 1 (1) | 2 (1) | 1 (1) | 11 |
| Marriage | 13 (10) | 7 (7) | 1 (2) | 1 (2) | 3 (3) | 1 (2) | 26 |
| Chums | 25 (28) | 25 (21) | 5 (5) | 7 (7) | 8 (9) | 5 (5) | 75 |
| Neighbors | 5 (3) | 0 (2) | 1 (0) | 0 (1) | 0 (1) | 1 (0) | 7 |
| Occupation | 3 (6) | 4 (4) | 2 (1) | 3 (1) | 2 (2) | 1 (1) | 15 |
| Citizenship | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 1 (0) | 0 (1) | 1 |
| TOTALS | 51 | 38 | 9 | 12 | 16 | 9 | 135 |

Table 45*: The Bogardus Scale vs. Question 18 (miles from center of a city where minority groups are represented)

| | Non-Response | In Area | Under 10 | 10-25 | 25-50 | 50-100 | 100+ | TOTALS |
|--------------|--------------|---------|----------|---------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| Non-Response | 0 (0) | 0 (2) | 8 (5) | 2 (3) | 0 (1) | 0 (0) | 1 (0) | 11 |
| Marriage | 0 (0) | 8 (4) | 8 (11) | 7 (6) | 2 (2) | 1 (1) | 0 (1) | 26 |
| Chums | 1 (1) | 10 (12) | 32 (32) | 22 (18) | 4 (6) | 3 (3) | 3 (3) | 75 |
| Neighbors | 0 (0) | 1 (1) | 5 (3) | 0 (2) | 0 (1) | 0 (0) | 1 (0) | 7 |
| Occupation | 1 (0) | 2 (2) | 4 (6) | 2 (4) | 3 (1) | 2 (1) | 1 (1) | 15 |
| Citizenship | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 1 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 1 |
| TOTALS | 2 | 21 | 57 | 33 | 10 | 6 | 6 | 135 |

Table 46*: The Bogardus Scale vs. Question 19 (what a respondent would do if a project were set up near him)

| | Non-Response | Oppose | In-different | Support | Involved | Several Hours | Other | Comments | TOTALS |
|--------------|--------------|--------|--------------|---------|----------|---------------|---------|----------|--------|
| Non-Response | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (1) | 4 (2) | 5 (6) | 2 (2) | 0 (0) | 11 |
| Marriage | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 2 (3) | 0 (4) | 18 (13) | 4 (4) | 2 (1) | 26 |
| Chums | 1 (1) | 0 (0) | 1 (1) | 9 (9) | 14 (12) | 38 (39) | 11 (12) | 1 (2) | 75 |
| Neighbors | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 2 (1) | 1 (1) | 3 (4) | 1 (1) | 0 (0) | 7 |
| Occupation | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 3 (2) | 3 (2) | 6 (8) | 3 (2) | 0 (0) | 15 |
| Citizenship | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 1 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (1) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 1 |
| TOTALS | 1 | 0 | 1 | 17 | 22 | 70 | 21 | 3 | 135 |

| Table 47: The Bogardus Scale vs. Question 20 (how respondents feel about "Sabbath" inner-city work) | | | | | | |
|---|--------------|----------------|-------------------|-------------|------------|-----------------|
| | Non-Response | Approve Openly | Reserved Approval | No Feelings | Disapprove | Comments TOTALS |
| Non-Response | 0 (0) | 2 (4) | 3 (1) | 2 (1) | 2 (2) | 2 (3) 11 |
| Marriage | 0 (0) | 17 (10) | 2 (2) | 0 (2) | 0 (4) | 7 (8) 26 |
| Chums | 1 (1) | 23 (28) | 3 (6) | 6 (7) | 16 (12) | 26 (22) 75 |
| Neighbors | 0 (0) | 2 (3) | 0 (1) | 1 (1) | 3 (1) | 1 (2) 7 |
| Occupation | 0 (0) | 6 (6) | 2 (1) | 3 (1) | 0 (2) | 4 (4) 15 |
| Citizenship | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 1 (0) | 0 (0) 1 |
| TOTALS | 1 | 50 | 10 | 12 | 22 | 40 135 |

APPENDIX VIII

Tables 48-50: Relationships of Some of the Responses to Questions with Others: Selected Chi-Square Tables (see Note in Appendix V, page 119)

Table 48*: Question 9 (how involved respondents would become, if asked) vs. Question 10 (miles from nearest Adventist inner-city project)

| | Within 10 | Within 25 | Within 50 | Within 100 | 100+ | Don't Know | TOTALS |
|--------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|------------|--------|------------|--------|
| Non-Response | 0 (1) | 1 (1) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 1 (0) | 2 |
| Intimately | 27 (23) | 17 (17) | 5 (4) | 3 (5) | 5 (7) | 4 (4) | 61 |
| Help | 14 (17) | 12 (13) | 4 (3) | 7 (4) | 6 (5) | 2 (3) | 45 |
| Cautious | 2 (2) | 2 (2) | 0 (0) | 0 (1) | 1 (1) | 1 (0) | 6 |
| Reject | 0 (1) | 1 (1) | 0 (0) | 1 (0) | 0 (0) | 1 (0) | 3 |
| Other | 7 (6) | 5 (5) | 0 (1) | 1 (1) | 3 (2) | 0 (1) | 16 |
| Comments | 1 (1) | 0 (1) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 1 (0) | 0 (0) | 2 |
| TOTALS | 51 | 38 | 9 | 12 | 16 | 9 | 135 |

Table 49*: Question 9 (how involved respondents would become, if asked) vs. Question 18 (miles from center of a city where minority groups are represented)

| | Non-Response | | In Area | Under 10 | 10-25 | 25-50 | 50-100 | 100+ | TOTALS |
|--------------|--------------|---------|---------|----------|---------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| Non-Response | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 1 (1) | 0 (0) | 1 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 2 |
| Intimately | 0 (1) | 10 (9) | 10 (9) | 26 (26) | 17 (15) | 3 (5) | 2 (3) | 3 (3) | 61 |
| Help | 2 (1) | 5 (7) | 5 (7) | 19 (19) | 9 (11) | 6 (3) | 3 (2) | 1 (2) | 45 |
| Cautious | 0 (0) | 0 (1) | 0 (1) | 3 (3) | 2 (1) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 1 (0) | 6 |
| Reject | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 1 (1) | 2 (1) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 3 |
| Other | 0 (0) | 6 (2) | 6 (2) | 6 (7) | 3 (4) | 0 (1) | 1 (1) | 0 (1) | 16 |
| Comments | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 1 (1) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 1 (0) | 2 |
| TOTALS | 2 | 21 | 21 | 57 | 33 | 10 | 6 | 6 | 135 |

Table 50*: Question 4 (response to the seminary sending ministerial students to work in Washington, D. C.) vs. Question 20 (how respondents feel about inner-city work)

| | Non-Response | Approve Openly | Reserved Approval | No Feelings | Disapprove | Comments | TOTALS |
|---------------|--------------|-------------------|----------------------|----------------|------------|----------|--------|
| In Favor | 0 (0) | 40 (36) | 9 (7) | 6 (9) | 13 (16) | 29 (29) | 97 |
| No Concern | 0 (1) | 3 (3) | 0 (1) | 1 (1) | 1 (1) | 2 (2) | 7 |
| Against | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 1 (0) | 0 (0) | 1 |
| Haven't Heard | 1 (0) | 7 (9) | 1 (2) | 5 (2) | 3 (4) | 7 (7) | 24 |
| Other | 0 (0) | 0 (2) | 0 (0) | 0 (1) | 4 (1) | 2 (2) | 6 |
| TOTALS | 1 | 50 | 10 | 12 | 22 | 40 | 135 |

APPENDIX IX

Tables 51-60: Relationships of Some of the Personal Characteristics with Others: Selected Chi-Square Tables (see Note in Appendix V, page 119)

| Table 51*: Attendance at a Non-S.D.A. School vs. Age | | | | | |
|--|--------------|--------------|---------|---------|-------------|
| | Non-Response | 29 and Under | 30-44 | 45-59 | 60 and Over |
| | | | | | TOTALS |
| Non-Response | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 1 (2) | 5 (3) | 0 (1) |
| Yes | 0 (0) | 0 (3) | 17 (15) | 32 (32) | 9 (7) |
| No | 1 (1) | 8 (4) | 16 (18) | 38 (39) | 8 (9) |
| TOTALS | 1 | 8 | 34 | 75 | 17 |
| | | | | | 135 |

Table 52*: Position of Employment vs. Sex

| | Male | Female | TOTALS |
|--------------------|---------|--------|--------|
| Non-Response | 1 (1) | 0 (0) | 1 |
| General Conference | 32 (33) | 2 (1) | 34 |
| Union Conference | 21 (22) | 1 (0) | 22 |
| Local Conference | 21 (30) | 0 (1) | 31 |
| Pastor | 41 (40) | 0 (1) | 41 |
| Other | 6 (6) | 0 (0) | 6 |
| TOTALS | 132 | 3 | 135 |

Table 53: Position of Employment vs. Age

| | Non-Response | 29 and Under | 30-44 | 45-59 | 60 and Over | TOTALS |
|--------------------|--------------|--------------|---------|---------|-------------|--------|
| Non-Response | 1 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (1) | 0 (0) | 1 |
| General Conference | 0 (0) | 0 (2) | 3 (9) | 25 (19) | 6 (4) | 34 |
| Union Conference | 0 (0) | 0 (1) | 4 (6) | 12 (12) | 6 (3) | 22 |
| Local Conference | 0 (0) | 3 (2) | 10 (8) | 14 (17) | 4 (4) | 31 |
| Pastor | 0 (0) | 5 (2) | 14 (10) | 12 (33) | 1 (5) | 41 |
| Other | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 3 (2) | 3 (3) | 0 (1) | 6 |
| TOTALS | 1 | 8 | 34 | 75 | 17 | 135 |

Table 54: Position of Employment vs. Years in Denominational Service

| | Non-Response | 0-9 | 10-19 | 20-29 | 30-39 | 40-49 | TOTALS |
|--------------------|--------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|--------|--------|
| Non-Response | 1 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 1 |
| General Conference | 0 (0) | 0 (5) | 1 (6) | 14 (13) | 15 (8) | 4 (2) | 34 |
| Union Conference | 0 (0) | 2 (3) | 3 (4) | 7 (8) | 9 (5) | 1 (1) | 22 |
| Local Conference | 0 (0) | 6 (5) | 6 (6) | 14 (12) | 4 (7) | 1 (1) | 31 |
| Pastor | 0 (0) | 11 (6) | 14 (8) | 13 (16) | 3 (9) | 0 (2) | 41 |
| Other | 0 (0) | 1 (1) | 1 (1) | 4 (2) | 0 (1) | 0 (0) | 6 |
| TOTALS | 1 | 20 | 25 | 52 | 31 | 6 | 135 |

Table 55*: Position of Employment vs. Race

| | Non-Response | Caucasian | Negro | Oriental | TOTALS |
|--------------------|--------------|-----------|--------|----------|--------|
| Non-Response | 0 (0) | 1 (1) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 1 |
| General Conference | 1 (1) | 30 (30) | 2 (3) | 1 (0) | 34 |
| Union Conference | 0 (0) | 21 (19) | 1 (2) | 0 (0) | 22 |
| Local Conference | 0 (0) | 28 (27) | 3 (3) | 0 (0) | 31 |
| Pastor | 1 (1) | 34 (36) | 6 (4) | 0 (0) | 41 |
| Other | 0 (0) | 5 (5) | 1 (1) | 0 (0) | 6 |
| TOTALS | 2 | 119 | 13 | 1 | 135 |

Table 56: Position of Employment vs. Attendance at the S.D.A. Seminary

| | Non-Attendance | Attendance | TOTALS |
|--------------------|----------------|------------|--------|
| Non-Response | 0 (1) | 1 (0) | 1 |
| General Conference | 23 (2) | 11 (12) | 34 |
| Union Conference | 19 (14) | 3 (8) | 22 |
| Local Conference | 24 (20) | 7 (11) | 31 |
| Pastor | 18 (27) | 23 (14) | 41 |
| Other | 4 (4) | 2 (2) | 6 |
| TOTALS | 88 | 47 | 135 |

Table 57*: Position of Employment vs. College Major

| | None | Theology | Business | History | Education | Other | TOTALS |
|--------------------|--------|----------|----------|---------|-----------|--------|--------|
| Non-Response | 1 (0) | 0 (1) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 1 |
| General Conference | 0 (3) | 18 (22) | 5 (3) | 3 (3) | 4 (2) | 4 (3) | 34 |
| Union Conference | 1 (2) | 12 (14) | 5 (2) | 2 (2) | 2 (1) | 0 (2) | 22 |
| Local Conference | 3 (2) | 20 (20) | 2 (3) | 2 (2) | 0 (1) | 4 (2) | 31 |
| Pastor | 4 (3) | 33 (26) | 0 (4) | 2 (3) | 0 (2) | 2 (3) | 41 |
| Other | 1 (0) | 4 (4) | 0 (1) | 1 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 6 |
| TOTALS | 10 | 87 | 12 | 10 | 6 | 10 | 135 |

Table 58: Position of Employment vs. Graduate Major

| | None | Theology | Education | History | Speech | Business | TOTALS |
|--------------------|---------|----------|-----------|---------|--------|----------|--------|
| Non-Response | 0 (1) | 1 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 1 |
| General Conference | 18 (20) | 9 (11) | 4 (2) | 1 (1) | 2 (1) | 0 (0) | 34 |
| Union Conference | 19 (13) | 1 (7) | 1 (1) | 1 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 22 |
| Local Conference | 21 (18) | 5 (10) | 2 (2) | 1 (1) | 1 (1) | 1 (0) | 31 |
| Pastor | 18 (24) | 23 (13) | 0 (2) | 0 (1) | 0 (1) | 0 (0) | 41 |
| Other | 2 (3) | 3 (2) | 1 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 6 |
| TOTALS | 78 | 42 | 8 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 135 |

Table 59*: Position of Employment vs. Attendance at a Non-S.D.A. School

| | Non-Response | Attendance | Non-Attendance | TOTALS |
|--------------------|--------------|------------|----------------|--------|
| Non-Response | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 1 (1) | 1 |
| General Conference | 1 (2) | 18 (15) | 15 (18) | 34 |
| Union Conference | 1 (1) | 8 (9) | 13 (12) | 22 |
| Local Conference | 1 (1) | 14 (13) | 16 (16) | 31 |
| Pastor | 2 (2) | 13 (18) | 26 (22) | 41 |
| Other | 1 (0) | 5 (3) | 0 (3) | 6 |
| TOTALS | 6 | 58 | 71 | 135 |

Table 60*: Position of Employment vs. Level of Non-S.D.A. Education

| | Non-Response | College | Master's | Doctoral | Other Degree | TOTALS |
|--------------------|--------------|---------|----------|----------|--------------|--------|
| Non-Response | 1 (1) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 1 |
| General Conference | 17 (20) | 3 (5) | 8 (6) | 5 (3) | 1 (1) | 34 |
| Union Conference | 14 (13) | 3 (3) | 2 (4) | 3 (2) | 0 (0) | 22 |
| Local Conference | 18 (18) | 5 (4) | 7 (5) | 0 (3) | 1 (1) | 31 |
| Pastor | 29 (24) | 5 (5) | 3 (7) | 4 (4) | 0 (1) | 41 |
| Other | 1 (4) | 2 (1) | 2 (1) | 0 (1) | 1 (0) | 6 |
| TOTALS | 80 | 18 | 22 | 12 | 3 | 135 |

ABSTRACT

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to attempt an understanding of the attitudes of Seventh-day Adventist leaders toward inner-city work. Eleven specifying questions were used as a basis for constructing a questionnaire designed to determine just what such attitudes are. This questionnaire consisted of a Bogardus Social Distance Scale, 19 multiple-choice questions, and two-thirds of a page of personal characteristics. It was then sent to a stratified random sample of the denomination's leaders; approximately 47 per cent of the sample completed and returned the questionnaire by an arbitrarily set cut-off date. The data was then analyzed by use of the Scientific Computation Facility at Loma Linda University, under NIH Grant RR0027606.

In general, the respondents showed concern and interest in the study, and were quite thorough in their completion of the questionnaire. Many also chose to write in comments to certain questions.

An analysis of the data showed the leaders of the Seventh-day Adventist Church to be highly in favor of inner-city work, although not without certain qualifications. Many were concerned that a "balance" always be maintained, because such work is only one aspect of the total "mission of the church." Others were especially concerned about who should do the work--ministers, students, or other laymen--and in what capacity. Whether such work is of a type that could be carried out on the "Sabbath" also proved to be an aspect of special interest. This question prompted more write-in comments than any

other, and provoked the most vehement responses.

Personal characteristics such as age, length of denominational service, and level of occupational position also were compared with attitudes toward both race relations and inner-city work. In general, the respondents--with some exceptions--were much more open minded toward both aspects than I had expected. Also, the sample used for this research project proved to be less reactionary with increasing age than has been the case in other studies, e.g. Bettelheim and Janowitz. In fact, many of the most favorable attitudes were manifested by those who were in the older age categories, and whose position of employment was at the General Conference level.

337523

THEOLOGY LIBRARY
CLAREMONT, CALIF.